

The COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

(Published twice monthly).

Vol. VIII. Nos. 3-4.

Workers' Library Publishers,
35 East 125th St., New York.

February 15th, 1931

CONTENTS

	Page
A POLITICAL SUMMARY OF 1930	78
THE INDUSTRIAL PROGRAMME FOR THE DECISIVE YEAR OF THE FIVE YEAR PLAN	85
TENDENCIES TOWARDS FASCISM IN GREAT BRITAIN	91
By J. Fineberg	
THE PROBLEM OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE WORLD ECONOMIC CRISIS INTO A POLITICAL CRISIS	97
By A. Martynov	
INDIA IN 1930	105
By M. Ali	
THE INTERNATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE REVOLUTION OF 1905	113

TEN CENTS

A POLITICAL SUMMARY OF 1930

1930 brought about great changes in the situation of the capitalist world. Only twelve months ago, on the eve of 1930, bourgeois and Social-Democratic economists, denying the existing economic crisis, confidentially predicted that the temporary "depression" would be quickly overcome. Ahead of them lay the acceptance of the Young Plan, and bourgeois and Social-Democratic publicists, politicians and theoreticians wrote a whole library to prove that the acceptance of the Young Plan would mark the beginning of a new rise of capitalism—in Germany as well. Already at that time a Marxist-Leninist analysis permitted the Communist International, at the February Enlarged Presidium of the E.C.C.I., to record the *maturing of a world economic crisis*. Not only the Hilferdings and Bauers, but the Brandlers and Trotskys ridiculed the "illiterate economic" leadership of the Comintern. Opportunists of all shades appealed for abstention from "strike hazards" since "strikes are impossible under conditions of economic depression." Only twelve months have passed since then! And now what was clear at that time only to Marxist-Leninists has "suddenly" changed into a menacing fact for capitalism, a fact which is beginning to dislocate fundamentally the whole after-war system of the capitalist world. The world economic crisis is continuing to grow now in a number of the most important capitalist countries and, far from having reached its culminating point, is developing into a political crisis. Now, many bourgeois economists speak of a crisis even greater than that of 1918-19, and begin to doubt the very possibility of retaining the capitalist system. Now, the Messrs. Trotskys and Brandlers carry out their service to Social-Fascism with their peculiar defeatist slogan, their "super-radical" declaration to the effect that a revolutionary situation is already present in a number of great capitalist countries, and there is, therefore, no need now to carry on economic struggles, since at the given moment only revolutionary struggles are on the order of the day.

A year ago, the League of Nations and the Social-Fascists were still in a position to cover up their active preparation for a new imperialist war and their particularly feverish preparation

for intervention against the Soviet Union with the proclamation of a new era of pacifism resulting from the Young Plan and the conference on "disarmament." 1930 brought with it a second Hague Conference, the evacuation of the Rhine, the "Pan-European" Briand project, the Geneva "Disarmament" Conference, with the "prospect of repeating this conference on a "world" scale—"round about 1932." And this same 1930 is stamped with intervention against the U.S.S.R., being definitely fixed and planned by the French General Staff, with the trial of the "Industrial Party in Moscow," with the enormous provocative work of the Second International in preparation for intervention, with the extreme tensivity of French-Italian, French-German and Polish-German relations, with a new war-imperialist bloc and direct preparations of the capitalist governments for war.

Now, well behind the times, bourgeois economists acknowledge that very soon after the beginning of the economic crisis it became clear that "it was necessary to count on the continuance of the economic depression for a longer period; but the gravity of the results were not then realised and the disappointment became stronger as the economic decline grew sharper from month to month." ("Berliner-Zeitung," 1/1/1931.)

Now the *bourgeoisie themselves* speak *openly* of the direct danger of war. The most important organ of German monopolist capital in its New Year review summarised the war prospects of Europe in most sombre colours.

"The tension of the relations hidden in the atmosphere of 1930, is equal to that which existed a decade and a half ago, on the eve of the world war . . . Sparks fly to the powder-barrel and a suitable appeal this New Year's night is not a gay toast for the coming year, but a serious charge to everyone and to all: hurry, or it will be too late." ("Kolnische Zeitung," 1/1/1931.)

The signs of the times are visible, as on the eve of the war of 1914, in the appearance of a book by General Ludendorff (and a large number of other similar publications)—"War Approaches"—in which the clear hand of a "specialist" describes the rapid devastation of Europe as the result of a military clash of "two coalitions."

The vulture smells the carrion.

Up to the February Enlarged Presidium of the E.C.C.I., by no means all the capitalist world was enveloped by the new economic crisis. Such important capitalist countries as decaying England and "flowering" France were in a state of pre-crisis development. The crisis by then affected most sharply the textile industry and had not yet reached the basic branches of heavy industry. In fact, while a severe agrarian crisis was already present and colonial and semi-colonial countries were in its grip, capitalism still lived then in the hope of a speedy relief with the approach of the summer and even of the possible rapid elimination of the crisis. Now the picture has changed radically. There is actually no single more or less important capitalist country which has not been affected by the crisis. Together with this, in no one field—be it that of production, or export, or investment, or the circulation of goods—are there proofs of a change in the economic situation, *are there any symptoms of immediate improvement*. The crisis has hit hardest of all the metal, chemical, electrical and mining industries. A growth of monopolies, accompanying the growth of disorganisation of capitalism, is characteristic of the present crisis—a historical lesson to the bards of organised capitalism." At the same time, the antagonism grows not only between separate capitalist countries, but between separate industries within capitalist countries.

The reduction in production is much greater than in all former pre-war crises. Characteristic of the present crisis is the fact that, regardless of the tremendous reduction in production, the world *reserve* of goods has not only not been reduced, but has, on the contrary, *increased*.

World wholesale *prices* continue to fall, but while the prices of foodstuffs fell least of all (and even increased in France), prices of manufactured goods fell to a greater degree, those of industrial raw materials still more, and most of all—those of agricultural raw materials. This characteristic decline in prices reveals the general nature of the present crisis. The difference between the decline in prices in industry and agriculture shows that, in fact, it is above all a crisis in agriculture and raw materials.

What thus passes before our eyes is not only a world economic crisis, but a *crisis of peasant farming* in its full historical significance.

Parallel with the rapid development of the mechanisation of agriculture (in the U.S.A. and other countries), the pauperisation of tremendous strata of the small and middle peasantry goes on. Millions of the village toilers are joining the ranks of the opposition to the bourgeois State.

The unavoidable result of the intensification and increased rate of the development of the crisis was the *stupendous worsening of the condition of the working-class*. Unemployment is growing to unprecedented dimensions and at an accelerated pace; a direct attack on wages is taking place; all forms of social insurance are being attacked.

The world economic crisis is developing in a far from *uniform* manner. Its extent is completely different in the countries of the victors and of the vanquished, in the colonies and in the metropolis, in agrarian countries and in industrial ones. But the crisis has already affected the whole capitalist world and all aspects of capitalist economy.

A natural result of the development of the crisis was the general intensification of the economic struggle and competition in the capitalist world. The accentuation of all antagonisms of capitalism, already recorded by the Communist International at the beginning of the third period, as a result of the crisis stimulated by and in its turn stimulating, the general post-war crisis of capitalism, is passing to a *qualitatively higher level*. Hence the growing instability in international capitalist relations. Hence, with the successful realisation of the "Five Year Plan" in four years, the growing preparations for intervention against the U.S.S.R. Hence the increased tendencies to Fascism and the development of the economic crisis into a political crisis in a number of capitalist countries—depending on the greater or lesser degree of the economic crisis, and on the manoeuvring possibilities of the bourgeoisie.

That is why the bourgeoisie the world over were full of anxiety and uncertainty on the eve of 1930. The collected bourgeois "Frankfurter Zeitung," in its Christmas review of the world situation, put the question of the "necessity of investigating the *causes* of the grave economic difficulties in order to determine *to what extent these causes are accidental or unavoidable*, to what extent they actually arise from the *system* on

which our economy is founded and to *what extent* in conformity with this, there *exists the possibility and the hope for solving* this question." Another leading German bourgeois newspaper, the "Kolnische Zeitung," in a special New Year supplement on the "State-political tasks of the bourgeoisie," sets down "four fatal questions."

(A) "Can a *bourgeois government*, i.e., a government created and educated on the basis of the spiritual and cultural forces of the nineteenth century, be retained?"

(B) "Shall we be able to steer the capitalist economic system, created on the idea of private property, its defence and its development, through the turbulence of these confused times?"

(C) "Shall we have the strength and means to guarantee freedom . . . to our people from the chains laid on them (i.e., from the Versailles Treaty)?"

(D) "Shall we succeed in such tense times in saving, strengthening or to organising the *elements of responsibility and prudence*?"

The rate of the development and the sharpness of the crisis is such that it compels even some bourgeois economists to speak of the situation of capitalism as worse now than it was directly after the war. And, as a matter of fact, regardless of the fact that capitalism was then still covered with the bloody wounds of war, regardless of the presence then of a direct revolutionary situation in a number of countries, the *manoeuvring possibilities* of the bourgeoisie were greater then than now. This refers not to a *mechanical* comparison, but to the *prospects*.

How is this expressed?

(1) The Soviet Union—this basic factor of contradictions in the contemporary world—has since then grown into a gigantic political and economic power. The *world significance* of the very existence of the Soviet Union as a revolutionary factor has grown to an *extraordinary degree*. History has cruelly revenged itself on the bourgeoisie and the Social-Fascists. During the civil war they said that the Bolsheviks knew only how to destroy, that a proletarian dictatorship can build nothing. When the Five Year Plan began they said that the proletarian dictatorship would lose itself in a blind alley, that the more it builds, the smaller will be its prospect for building up Socialism, that the greater the break with the village, the stronger will be the dissatisfaction of the working-class

itself, entailed by the unavoidable breakdown in provisions. The bourgeoisie were convinced that Socialism could not stand the test. The greater its disappointment the greater its fear, because the bourgeoisie understand how great is the revolutionary significance of the *realised* Five Year Plan for the widest masses of toilers in the capitalist countries.

The bourgeoisie is now becoming convinced not only of the realizability of the Five Year Plan, but also of the fact that towards the end of the third year of the Plan the U.S.S.R. *will complete the economic foundation of Socialism*. And if during the civil war the world bourgeoisie organised intervention against what the proletarian dictatorship was *destroying*, now the bourgeoisie and the Second International are feverishly preparing intervention against what the proletarian dictatorship is *building*. The very existence of the Soviet Union now sticks in the throat of the Versailles system. This is just what feeds the particular anti-Soviet activity of all the bourgeois governments which created and strengthened the Versailles system and above all, of French imperialism. This is just what feeds the particular anti-Soviet activity (under the indescribably base provocateur mask of "pacifism") of the Social-Fascist parties and the Second International which see a *possibility of saving their position* with the working-class of capitalist countries *only in the physical annihilation of the proletarian dictatorship*.

(2) Imperialist governments had incomparably greater possibilities in the first years after the war than to-day to exploit the *colonial and semi-colonial* countries. The powerful sweep of the revolutionary movement in the colonies has *diminished* the extraordinarily *manoeuvring possibilities* of the imperialist bourgeoisie.

(3) Due to the considerable industrial development of a number of agrarian countries of Europe after the war, capitalism has lost great reserves in this field as well.

(4) *Even the growth of Fascism* bears witness to the limitation of the *manoeuvring possibilities* of the bourgeoisie. Fascism, born as a result of a general crisis of capitalism after the war, grows tremendously now as the political expression of the new, present-day, economic crisis. And, while in 1919-20 the bourgeoisie of Central European countries could unite under the slogan

of "democracy" for a counter-revolutionary suppression of the proletarian uprising, now it is impossible. It is just in this that the meaning of the growth of Fascism lies. This is the essence of the *fascisation* of Social-Democracy which now, choosing the "lesser evil" serves, for example, the government of Brüning in Germany, supposedly against the National-Socialists, but who would, with the advent of Hitler to power, look for a way of uniting with 100 per cent. Fascism. This does not, certainly, exclude some "democratic" manoeuvres of Fascism itself, should this prove, at the moment, expedient.

(5) Though the influence of the Social-Democracy and its mass base are still very great, due to the consequence, for the working-class, of capitalist rationalisation, and particularly because of the world economic crisis, it has already been greatly injured. And although Social-Democracy is yet to play a more abominable hangman's role in the coming great revolutionary struggles, and although it appears more and more as an open ally of Fascist governments, and as a most active force for intervention against the U.S.S.R., its role, nevertheless, as a mass support of monopolist capital within the working-class (still very strong!) will decline more and more with every month.

(6) Finally, the state of the *subjective* factor of the proletarian revolution is now different from what it was ten, twelve years ago. When the Fascist *coup d'état* took place in Italy, it was after the defeat of the working-class and in the absence of a mass Communist Party. Even in Germany in 1923, though there were hundreds of thousands of members of the C.P.G., there was not yet a real Bolshevik Party. Now the situation is entirely different. The process of the Bolshevisation of the Communist Party has gone incomparably further than at that period. In such a country as Germany, where the process of the development of the economic crisis into a political crisis has gone furthest, and where the revolutionary class struggle is most immediate, the political influence of the Party (as shown in the last elections to the Reichstag), reaches millions and millions of the proletariat. The Party grows rapidly in numerical strength (in November, 1930, there were 155,000 dues-paying members and 185,000 enrolled members in the Party) while qualitatively, the Party has

made striking progress in Bolshevisation—from a decisive defeat of Trotskyism through a struggle with the right-renegade opposition of Brandler to the liquidation of Merkerism and the attempts of the right-cum-"left" bloc. All this places the role of the subjective factor of the proletarian revolution under present conditions in a different light in comparison to the period directly after the war. And the faster this subjective factor grows, the stronger it becomes, the easier will it be to break up the attempt of the bourgeoisie to create a new wide mass base for itself through the national and social demagoguery of Fascism, and the smaller will become the manoeuvring possibilities of the bourgeoisie.

* * *

This situation is particularly clearly shown up by a more careful study of the crisis in those countries where it has already developed into a political crisis, where prerequisites for the maturing of the revolutionary class struggle have already been created. *Germany* in this sense, is the more striking example. Here we have the rapid *development of preparation for a decisive struggle* between two basic forces acting now in the arena of class struggle—between Fascism and Communism.

What does the development of an economic crisis into a political one signify and what expression does it take?

A political crisis by itself does not yet mean a direct revolutionary situation. But it is the *eve* of revolution. Lenin repeatedly characterised a political crisis as that time when the upper class can no longer live as formerly, but when the degree of activity and ability of the lower class to fight (already strong in itself) does not yet conform to the degree of the disorganisation of the upper class. This does *not* mean that a political crisis develops from above, in a *parliamentary* way. One or another change of government, just as one or another encroachment on the rights of parliament or on the external forms of "democracy" still does not signify the presence of a political crisis in a country. A sure external proof of the existence of a political crisis is the basic regrouping of the political forces in the bourgeois camp. But this proof is not a factor "in itself," but is the *result* of pressure from *below*, of a keen *sharpening* of the *basic class antagonisms*. The regrouping of the political forces in the bourgeois camp, the

greater or smaller *appearance* of Fascism, goes on *not spontaneously*, but only as a *result of a basic re-alignment of social forces*, of the greater or lesser accentuation of the *danger of a proletarian revolution*. Fascism in Germany (as in Austria, Rumania and Finland) is an attempt of preventive counter-revolution on the part of the bourgeoisie and not the result of a political regrouping within the bourgeoisie. Only Messrs. the Brandlers and Trotskys and other opportunists, who draw up a picture of a *struggle* between two groups of the bourgeoisie around the question of which of the two weapons to use: Fascism or Social-Democracy, see the matter in the latter light.

And if, on the one hand, it would be a great opportunist danger to underestimate the development of the economic crisis into a political one, to deny its existence, say, in Germany, would, on the other hand, constitute a no less opportunist danger masquerading behind "left" phrases and concealing real parliamentary cretinism, applying *mechanically* this process of development to *all* countries, to infer the existence of a political crisis only on the strength of external, formal signs of a parliamentary character. As a matter of fact, is it possible now to speak of a political crisis in the U.S.A. where, regardless of ten million unemployed, the bourgeoisie have still at their disposal tremendous reserves—just on the basis of Hoover's programme? Is it possible to speak of the existence of a political crisis in France as a result of the collapse of the Tardieu Government (even taking into account the fact that the fall was the result of the crash of his politics of "prosperity")? Undoubtedly, the rate of development of the economic crisis is very rapid here, the manoeuvring possibilities of the bourgeoisie are considerably less than in the U.S.A., and the *first harbingers* of the approaching political crisis are already present. But neither in France, nor particularly in the U.S.A., is there yet a serious *regrouping* within the bourgeois camp.

The situation in *England* is a great deal different. Here, the present crisis is developing under conditions of the classic decay of capitalism after the war, under conditions of chronic unemployment of millions and the backward state of production in organised technique, under conditions of a chronic crisis in the whole

imperial system. That is why the crisis is developing at such a furious speed and is placing the problems of the Empire with such extraordinary sharpness. England which until the war, was the foremost export country, was *third* in 1930. The recent Imperial Conference showed how far the *centrifugal* tendencies of the Dominions have moved. It is characteristic that on the very eve of the Imperial Conference, which was to create an outlet for English exports, Australia raised the tariff rate 50 per cent. and Canada (on iron, steel and cotton) 25 per cent. A deep, revolutionary, fermenting process is going on in the colonies. Even according to data in bourgeois newspapers there are 50,000 political prisoners in *India*. The problem of the Empire plays here approximately the same role (certainly *in its own way*) as the problem of reparations in Germany. This brings about in England a more rapid development of the economic crisis into a political one than in France. The existence *already of some elements of a political crisis* regardless of the fact that England was caught later by the crisis than other large capitalist countries. It is not accidental that the beginning of the political regrouping in the bourgeois camp (the split in the Conservative Party, the declaration of the Mosley group of the Labour Party) goes on round the problem of the Empire and the struggle for protectionism.

One can speak *seriously about the growing elements of a political crisis* in relation only to two important capitalist countries in Europe—*Germany and Poland*. Only in these two countries is a feverish regrouping of forces within the bourgeois camp taking place, is the polarisation of strength and the preparation for a decisive struggle between *Communism* and *Fascism* going on. It is true that the conditions under which the economic crisis in these two countries grows into a political one are not the same. While in Poland there is a Fascist dictatorship which finds it more and more difficult to appeal to petty bourgeois elements, in Germany, where National-Fascism is striving to gain power, it is still in a position, through its national and social demagoguery, to attract to itself new strata of petty bourgeoisie and even some sections (though to a very insignificant degree), of the proletariat. The closer the decisive conflict comes, the stronger grows the *competition* between *Communism* and *Fascism* for

influence over the petty bourgeois masses. That is why the development of a political crisis in these two countries, and first of all in Germany, is of tremendous *international significance*.

The decay of the traditional bourgeois parties of Germany was particularly evident during the last parliamentary elections in September, 1930. But this process had begun openly at the end of 1929 with dissension in the strongest bourgeois party in Germany, the Nationalists, and marked the coalescence of this party with the National-Socialists.

The big coalition held together for some months. Social-Democracy had to sanctify in the name of parliament and the "Weimar Constitution" the acceptance of the Young Plan and the act for the "preservation of the Republic" directed against the Communists. But the crisis had then already begun to dislocate the mass base of Social-Democracy, and the bourgeoisie, needed new strength and new methods. This was a serious step on the road to the fascisation of Germany. This does not mean, as opportunists, renegades, Brandlerites and Trotskyists asserted, "either Social-Democracy or Fascism," that the bourgeoisie threw the Social-Fascists completely over. But it means that at the given historical stage it was allotted another, externally less noticeable role, in order to give it the possibility to try to manoeuvre before the masses with pretended opposition to the government. However, with the sharpening of class antagonisms, Social-Democracy could carry on only such a policy as must necessarily undermine its mass base.

In the autumn, the economic crisis developed into a political one. The regrouping of forces in the bourgeois camp went on to a new stage which marked a qualitatively *higher degree* and a *new rate* of Fascist development.

This process is accompanied by a significant elemental growth in rank and file *revolutionary opposition* among the members of Social-Democracy, particularly among the Social-Democratic youth, the opposition being directed against the Social-Fascist politics of the Party and demanding stormily a real struggle with Fascism, but so far, conceiving this struggle in terms of "democracy" and Social-Democracy. At the same time, a "consolidation of all the upper wings of Social-Fascism" from the official "Vorwärts" to the "left" "Leipziger-

Volkszeitung," and the "ultra-left" "Klassenkampf" goes on under the characteristic slogan of the "struggle for discipline."

What are the *immediate prospects* and *immediate tactical tasks* for 1931?

Only a clear, and not a scholastic definition of the character of the present day development of the world economic crisis and the nature of its change into a political one gives the possibility of estimating such prospects correctly and of catching hold of the *most important tactical link* for the *given* historical stage. Undoubtedly the most important, one may say the all-embracing task of the Communist vanguard, under the conditions of the present day's furious, general and ever-increasing attack on the living conditions of the proletariat, is an independent organisation of the struggle against this attack. Only the organisation of such a struggle makes it possible to speed up to a maximum the process of winning over the majority of the working-class. After years of comparative calm, 1931 opens up under signs of growing, gigantic economic struggles. If the third period opened with mass economic struggles in the autumn of 1928 and the winter of 1929 (the Ruhr lockout, the general strike in Lodz, the general strike of the textile workers in Northern France, etc.), if the beginning of the period of the economic crisis under the influence of mass dismissals and the first consciousness of the attack by capital, the workers were restrained from economic struggles, then the present stage of the crisis, the revival and growth of activity of the working masses means the reproduction of economic struggles on a *higher plane*. The present economic struggle is a direct struggle for the initiative between attacking capital and the proletariat going into active counter-attack. A striking example of such a struggle is the strike of the Ruhr miners, where the working-class, under the leadership of the revolutionary trade union opposition for the first time in six or seven years proceeded to a *counter-offensive*, and declared a strike *before* the date appointed by the employers had expired. One needs but to mention those economic conflicts which are now taking place and which to-morrow will turn into open struggle, to be convinced of the *extent* of the movement that is developing. A revision of collective agreements embracing three-and-a-half million workers within the next two months,

is approaching in Germany. The whole of the Lower Rhine metal industry, 200,000 metal workers of Saxony, 500,000 textile workers, are now directly facing strikes and part have already entered on them). One hundred and fifty thousand railway workers are about to be discharged. Three hundred thousand chemical workers are facing a revision of rates in their agreement. And, in conclusion, the struggle of the Ruhr workers and the miners of Upper Silesia is far from over. In Britain, 150,000 miners in South Wales have been carrying on a stubborn strike. Part of the textile workers of Lancashire have declared a strike. The railway companies have put in a demand for such a decrease in wages that a sharp economic conflict must result. In Czecho-Slovakia, a great economic struggle in the metal, coal and glass industries has come to a head. The same is taking place in Poland—Dombrovo and in Upper Silesia.

The peculiar character of the new stage in the rise of activity among the working-class lies in a greater *unity of two currents of the movement*—those *working* in the industries and the *unemployed*. Sufficient value has not been attached to this fact until now by the Communist Parties. Yet it is one of the *most important events of the class struggle in the present historical stage*. The very process of the strikes has now a *qualitatively different* character than it had in former periods. The active participation of the unemployed, of workers' wives, the active sympathy of petty bourgeois elements of the towns and villages (of the poorest peasants of the surrounding villages) of small shopkeepers, artisans and others, give the present strikes (as it had given, for example, the strike of 140,000 metal workers in Berlin) the character of a "national" movement, "transmitting to the proletariat all the force of its *indignation with the regime*." (Lenin.)

It is from this that the problem of the mass political strike attains the position of the central, tactical link, which fact, according to Lenin, is at the same time an *expression* and a *condition* of the development of the proletarian struggle into a "national" movement. In July, 1929, the Tenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. laid down the mass political strike as the most important tactical problem of the third period. Opportunists, renegades, Brandlerites and Trotskyists did not hesitate to come forward with a criticism

of the "adventurist" tactics of the Comintern. These attacks of the opportunists have grown stronger, particularly in the course of the last period in connection with the absence of large mass political strikes. But here, too, the same thing took place as in the domain of pure economic battles. The Tenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. took place six months after the large economic struggles at the end of 1928 and beginning of 1929, directly after the first concrete statement of the problem of mass political strikes during the May struggles of 1929 in Berlin. The Tenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. was in session during a new growing rise of the *revolutionary workers' movement*. That is why the Tenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. placed the problem of mass political strikes in the centre of attention. And here, too, the economic crisis, as in purely economic struggles, arrested somewhat the development of the process. Now, under the condition of the economic crisis growing into a political one, particularly in those countries where there are now serious elements of a political crisis, the question of mass political strikes must be placed in the *centre of the attention of the Communist Parties* as the most important tactical link.

But here also there is great danger of an *abstract, purely schematic* description of the process of the development of mass strikes. If a negation of the very fact of the growth of the economic crisis into a political one unavoidably brings about incorrect conception of the place of mass political strikes in the system of the class struggle at the present stage, then, on the other hand, an over-valuation of the rate of development frequently exposes the Communist Parties to another danger—a description of mass political strikes as the *only* or *chief* form of class struggle in general. The danger of this error lies in the fact that it *ignores* on the one hand the significance of the higher form of struggle, as the final and *really main stage* of the revolutionary class struggle, and, on the other hand, the unfolding of the *class economic struggles* as the *point of departure* for the development of the *mass political strikes itself*. These are the same mistakes which Lenin pointed out in his struggle with the Mensheviks and in his polemics with Rosa Luxemburg.

* * *

Such is the sum total of 1930, the year of

world-wide economic crisis, the year of the greatest antagonisms in the capitalist world, the year of direct preparation of the working-class for revolutionary struggles. Such are the immediate prospects of the revolutionary proletarian movement and the immediate tactical tasks of the proletarian vanguard. Sharper and sharper grows the rate of *competition between Communism and Fascism* for influence over the masses, and particularly over the petty bourgeois masses. Fascism is the *main* danger:—Social-Fascism—is the main danger within the working-class. The struggle with Social-Fascism, tearing the workers away from Social-Democracy, is the most important lever in the struggle with Fascism. From this point of view the problem of a united front from below, of a

united front with the Social-Democratic workers (Christian and Fascist workers), and drawing them actively into a revolutionary struggle against Fascism—gains particular significance. The greatest danger to the Communist Parties would be the loss of tempo in this struggle, their hold of the masses not keeping pace with the rate of the developing crisis. On the energy of the Communist Parties, on their Bolshevik maturity, on their ability to lead the growing class struggle, to mobilise the army of millions of unemployed, their ability to direct the economic struggle on to political rails against the whole bourgeois State—depends the speed with which this last counter-revolutionary stake of the dying capitalist system will be lost.

THE INDUSTRIAL PROGRAMME FOR THE DECISIVE YEAR OF THE FIVE YEAR PLAN

THE RESULTS OF THE DECEMBER PLENUM OF THE C.P.S.U.

ON the agenda of the December Plenum of the Central Committee and Central Control Commission of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union were the items—(1) Control Figures for 1931, (2) the Food Question, (3) the new Soviet Elections.

This December Plenum was held shortly after the trial of the "Industrial Party," during which the full extent of the plan for military intervention against the Soviet Union and accompanying systematic sabotage which was intended to produce an industrial catastrophe in 1930 was revealed. The report on the Control Figures, which set out the balance of the preceding economic year and indicated the programme of activity for the coming year, demonstrated the futility of the endeavours of our class enemies. The year 1930 not only did not witness the bringing about of an economic catastrophe, it was a year of the highest achievement for Socialist construction.

Large-scale State industry in 1929-30 showed an increase in gross production of about 25% and thereby exceeded the proposals of the Five-Year Plan for this year by 5%, whereas during the first year of the Plan the increase over the proposals was only 3%. As a final result, the annual production of all factory industry in the

Soviet Union in 1929-30 has risen to more than double the level of the annual production before the war.

At the same time, a decisive turning point has been passed in the Socialist development of agriculture. Compared to the previous year the sown area increased by 9.8 million hectares. The gross output of the cotton harvest amounted to 13.5 million double-centners as compared with 8.6 millions in 1929, and the sugar beet harvest reached 151.7 million double-centners as against 62.5 millions in the previous year. On December 1st, 1930, already over 6.15 million peasant households, or 24.1% of the whole, had joined collective farms. In the principal grain regions, the percentage of collectivisation went up to as high as 49.3%. The socialised sector of agriculture in 1930 was responsible for approximately 50% of the total market production of grain. This means that *in the first two years of the Five-Year Plan, as far as collectivisation is concerned, the programme laid down for the whole five years has been fulfilled more than two-fold.*

Such a growth of national economy has assured the raising of the material and cultural standard of life of the workers. The number of industrial workers and office workers has

grown. In the two years of the Five-Year Plan, wages have increased by 12%. The seven-hour day has already been introduced for 45-50% of all industrial workers. *Unemployment has been practically liquidated.*

These achievements have made it possible for the Soviet Power to propose for 1931 a programme on such a scale as will make this year *the decisive year* in the realisation of the slogan of the Five-Year Plan in four years. It is not by chance that the Control Figures for 1931 have been called a "National Economic Plan." It is literally a question of such a plan, for in 1931, thanks to the impetuous growth of the Socialist sector, not only in industry but also in agriculture, the Soviet power will be in a position to deal in a planned fashion with the overwhelming proportion of the national economy. This can be judged from the following figures:—The Control Figures estimate the national income of the Soviet Union in 1931 (on the basis of prices in 1926-27) as 49 milliard roubles, which is almost identical with the amount originally estimated for the last year (1933) of the Five-Year Plan (viz., 49.7 milliard roubles). The national income since the beginning of the Five-Year Plan has been mounting by leaps and bounds from year to year, by 11%, then 19% and then 35%. *Two-thirds of the total national income estimated for 1931 will be included within the framework of the unified financial plan and distributed and utilised for Socialist construction.*

It is not necessary here to give in detail the proposals of the National Economic Plan for 1931. Only a few of the outstanding facts need be mentioned. The increase in the gross production of the whole State industry will amount to 45% in comparison with the previous year, representing a fulfilment of the total Five-Year Plan to the extent of 79% and in heavy industry to 98%. From these facts alone it is evident that 1931 will be *the decisive year*. In 1931, four gigantic industrial concerns will be partially set in operation, (the Dnieprostroi, the iron and steel works of Kuznetz and Magnetostroi, the Kharkov tractor works and the machine construction works of Cheliabinsk). According to statements of leading foreign engineers, these works are of such a magnitude that any one of them would represent a big event in the industrial life in any of the most highly developed capitalist countries. In Moscow alone the

construction has commenced of a modern large-scale works for the production of gears and ball-bearings, and two tool-making works, which can be reckoned as belonging to the greatest in the world. *In spite of the plans of the industrial saboteurs who attempted to tie up capital resources, in 1931 new undertakings will be set going of a value of 4,000,000,000 roubles.*

In connection with the enormous extension of industrial construction, the number of workers covered by industries coming under the plan of the Supreme Economic Council will increase by 10% and the number of workers in industries under the Commissariat of Supplies will increase by 16%. The total number of workers and employees will amount to 16 millions as against 14 millions the previous year.

In spite of the enormous capital investments, there will not be any need for new conversion of money. The Soviet power during the coming year will accumulate a State Reserve Fund of one-and-a-half milliard roubles.

Even more considerable than for industry will be the rate of development in 1931 of the Socialist transformation of the village. The machine basis of agriculture will be doubled. The steppe region of the Ukraine, the Northern Caucasus, the Lower and Middle Volga, will to the extent of 80% be covered by collective farming, that is to say, in these regions the effective collectivisation and the liquidation of the kulaks as a class will have been attained. In the other grain regions collectivisation will be carried through to the extent of 50% and in the auxiliary regions as far as grain production goes, to 20-25%, in the cotton and sugar beet regions at least to 50%. On a scale over the whole Soviet Union, not less than half all peasant households will be included in collectivisation.

From the foregoing facts it is evident that *"the year 1931 will complete the building of the foundations of Socialist economy of the Soviet Unions."* (The Plenum Resolution.)

Comrade Stalin, at the Sixteenth Party Congress of the C.P.S.U., declared that—

"We in the Soviet Union have already entered into the period of Socialism."

This conclusion aroused the opposition of the Right and the "Left" opportunists (Sirtsov-Lominadze). To-day it is not possible for them any longer to maintain the view which the Trotskyist opposition previously asserted, viz.,

that the building of Socialism in a single country, in the Soviet Union, is impossible. In view of the enormous achievements of the Soviet power such an assertion would be simply ludicrous. They, however, express the *same disbelief in the victory of Socialism* in another form. "We in the Soviet Union, contrary to the assertions of Comrade Stalin, have not yet entered the period of Socialism, because we are passing through the last stage of N.E.P., because the question 'Who—Whom' in the village is not yet decided," etc. It is clear that the Right and "Left" opportunists do not now proceed from the arguments which they earlier put forward, and which they now themselves describe as "mechanistic", but set out from an assumed lowering of wages and worsening of the conditions for the workers in the Soviet Union, a standpoint which they have taken from the Mensheviks' armoury of weapons.

These are sheer calumnies. In point of fact, both nominal and real wages are continuously rising in the Soviet Union and equally uninterruptedly is the position of the working-class improving in connection with the growing budget for social services, the growing expenditure for improvement of social living conditions, housing, education and in connection with the liquidation of unemployment. It is true that the absolute level of wages is not yet high enough. But this does not decide the question whether we in the Soviet Union have already entered into the period of Socialism or not. Socialism is not yet Communism. So much the less, then, can one identify with Communism the first stage of Socialism, which necessarily bears still many "birthmarks" of the capitalist social order, as Marx says. Decisive in this question is the socialisation of production and the beginning of the liquidation of classes. Proceeding from this starting-point, Stalin declared at the Sixteenth Party Congress:—

"No one can deny that we are standing on the threshold of the liquidation of the last important capitalist class, the kulak class. . . It is clear that we have already entered into the period of Socialism, for the Socialist sector has now all the levers of the whole national economy in its hand, although it is still far to the construction of Socialist society and the abolition of class differences."

So Stalin said in the summer of 1930! In the year 1931 we shall have in the Soviet Union a further mighty turn towards Socialism. We shall then not merely be able to declare that we

have entered into the period of Socialism but also that the establishment of the bases of Socialist economy in the Soviet Union is already completed.

This fact will be of enormous historical significance. The cleverer and more farsighted of our class enemies recognise this very well. Ever more frequently they speak with gnashing of teeth of the success of the Five-Year Plan, and precisely on this account the bourgeoisie is forcing military intervention against the Soviet Union.

* * *

The Leninist Party takes the view that, for the victory of Socialism, the rapid tempo of Socialist industrialisation, of collectivisation of agriculture, and the associated liquidation of the kulaks as a class, is of decisive significance. The Leninist Party takes the view that the extremely rapid *changes in productive relations in the Soviet Union*, now taking place before our eyes, is likewise of decisive significance for the victory of Socialism. It by no means follows from that that the Soviet power puts in the background the improvement of the material position of the workers and toilers, or postpones it to a subsequent day, as our class enemies slanderously assert. The question of supplying the workers with the necessities of life was a central point in the business of the December Plenum in connection with the report of the Commissariat of Supplies on the provision of food and vegetables as well as that of the Central Co-operative Union on the activity of the Consumers' unions.

Thanks to the energetic efforts of the Soviet power, the necessary pre-requisites have been created for an immediate improvement of supplies for workers and toilers and the conditions for making possible a decisive change in the situation in the autumn of 1931. Above all, the grain problem has been practically solved. The provision of sugar for workers and toilers is now guaranteed to the fullest extent. Supplies of sugar, exclusive of confectionery, have been increased by 36%. The possibility now exists for satisfactory supply to the working population of potatoes, vegetables and fish. Supplies of fish, exclusive of tinned goods, are being increased by 25%.

Considerably more difficult is the question of meat and fats. Nevertheless, here also the measures adopted by the Soviet power guarantee

a complete change in the situation by autumn, 1931. The great advance in the collectivisation of stock-breeding, together with the organisation of large-scale Soviet stock-breeding farms ("Skotovod," "Svinovod," "Ovtsevod") guarantee a rapid solution of the livestock problem. The livestock of these Soviet farms already exceeds the original estimates made in 1930, so that in 1931 the stock in "Skotovod" (horned cattle) will be increased to 2.8 million head, in "Svinovod" (pigs) to 1.9 millions and in "Ovtsevod" (sheep) to 4.4 millions.

For the provision of industrial goods also, favourable prospects are opened out, thanks to the extension of the sown area for industrial crops, which guarantees the necessary raw material for industry. The stocks of staple manufactures for mass consumption will be worth 14.6 milliard roubles in 1931, as against 11.5 milliards in the previous year, which together with the accumulated funds from agricultural production should increase the turnover in retail trade by 25-30% compared with 1930.

But while in the sphere of *production* the problem of supply is being successfully solved, in the sphere of *distribution* matters are far from being satisfactory. The Plenum put on record the *unsatisfactory* state of the work of Centrosoyus, the Central Union of Co-operatives, and of the entire system of the co-operative societies in catering for the workers, and also of the work of the Commissariat of Supply as far as its regard to the organisations the "Soyus-Miaso" (All-Union Meat Combine), and the "Soyus-Plodovosh" (All-Union Vegetables Combine), are concerned. The Joint Plenum of the Central Committee and Central Control Commission recorded that the apparatus of these two organisations were infected by hostile sabotaging elements (48 wreckers from them were shot), the Communists in charge not having really studied the question of meat and vegetable supply, but having confined themselves to bureaucratic circulars and "general" directions. As to the consumers' co-operative societies, they, too, according to the Plenum, showed the presence of a strong "Nepman spirit" in their work, of elements of inertia, of bureaucratism and opportunism in practice, which all lead to the accumulation of large unsold stocks, while products are scarce, their apparatus is being

infected with hostile and wrecking elements, their work in organising public feeding-places is very poor, the mass of their members take very little part of controlling and directing the work of the societies, and self-criticism does not exist.

The role of the wreckers in the co-operative societies should be specially noted. In an ordered manner, they *disorganised the supply of goods for the masses* by keeping back scarce articles in the warehouses and by despatching certain commodities to districts where there could obviously be no demand for them. Among the hostile elements from which the co-operative societies must be cleansed, the resolution of the Central Committee points out the "Menshevist, Social-Revolutionary and bureaucratic elements." This is worthy of special attention because international Social-Democracy is shedding crocodile tears over the famine of commodities in the U.S.S.R.

To liquidate all these undesirable factors, the Plenum indicated a number of decisive measures to be taken. First of all, there must be a thorough cleansing of the co-operative societies and the organs of supply from hostile, sabotaging Menshevist elements, and the preparation of young *proletarian* co-operative specialists, to be followed by the development and improvement of the work of the "reserved" distributing shops, a further development of public feeding-places, the restoration of elections for the boards of co-operative societies in the villages, the organisation of *class distribution* of goods, the reconstruction of the work of consumers' co-operative societies so as to guarantee the proper supply of food and commodities to the most important sectors of Socialist construction, linking up the work of supply with the realisation of the industrial plans, with the increasing of the efficiency of labour, the struggle against the fluctuation of factory staffs, and furthering the Socialist forms of the organisation of labour (Socialist competitions, shock brigades, etc.).

Having in view that the U.S.S.R. is entering the decisive year of the Five-Year Plan, when the foundation of Socialism in the country will be completed, while at the same time the danger of intervention is growing, the class struggle in the country is sharpening, and wreckers have been able to carry on systematic work in the

Soviet apparatus of undermining industry under the shelter of opportunists who have lost the feeling of proletarian vigilance towards the class enemy, the December Plenum adopted an extremely important decision, that "the elections to the Soviets must be a powerful weapon for reorganising the whole of the work of the Soviets in conformity with the tasks of the reconstruction period."

The Party apparatus, and to a less degree that of the trade unions, have already reorganised themselves to suit the needs of the reconstruction period and the growth of the Socialist offensive. The Soviet apparatus in this respect is still lagging behind. This, under present circumstances, cannot be permitted.

Not only is the policy of the Party with regard to the rate of industrialisation being realised at present, but, which is specially important, the kulaks are being liquidated as a class on the basis of wholesale collectivisation. Closely bound up with this, there is going on simultaneously a counter-attack of the counter-revolutionary elements inside the U.S.S.R. who place their hope in foreign intervention. The answer of the workers and peasants to the interventionist preparations must be a still more determined offensive of Socialism along the whole front and the maximum strengthening of the defences of the country. The foundations of Socialism being thus laid under such circumstances, and an intense and fierce class struggle going on, the role of the Soviets must be greatly increased, and for this purpose, such unity of the Party and Soviet leadership must be assured, such a close bond between the leaders of the Party and the heads of the Soviet, that the latter should in reality become organs for carrying out the general Party line, irreconcilably hostile to the Rights and to the "Left" opportunists, and that iron discipline should be enforced not only in the Party but in the Soviet organs as well. Such a reconstruction of the Soviets is *possible now* to the full extent, because the Soviets, which were the creation of the proletariat in the big industrial centres can now, on the basis of the rapid growth of large-scale production not only in the cities but in the country, fully bring out all the potentialities of the proletarian dictatorship, both internal and international, for the struggle for the victory of Socialism.

In order to carry out such reorganisation, the Plenum decided that it was necessary for the Soviets to rely for support on the new mass activists who have sprung up, in the first instance, on the shock-brigaders in the factories and the collective farmers in the country. These new activists, who have become the deciding force for raising Socialist industry and agriculture, must become the support of the Party and the Soviets in the work of improving the whole government apparatus, first of all that of the co-operatives and organs of supply. To make this reorganisation possible, the Plenum decided that the Leninist line of the Party must be fully carried out, without Right or "Left" distortions of this policy in Soviet *practice*, and chiefly in the practice of the leading organs of the Soviets. The Plenum decided that *under present conditions there cannot be any room in the leading organs of the Soviets for Right opportunists or for unprincipled conciliators.*

To strengthen the contact between the Party and the Soviets, and in order to guarantee that the general line of the Party will really be carried out in practice, a new Commission has been formed under the Soviet of Peoples' Commissars, in addition to the Council of Labour and Defence and the State Planning Department, namely the "Commission of Execution of Decisions." For this same purpose and for securing the carrying out of the general line of the Party in the practice of the Soviets, Comrade Molotov was appointed head of the Soviet of Peoples' Commissars instead of Comrade Rykov.

Comrades Rykov and Bukharin once more made a statement at the Plenum as to their agreement with the general line of the Party, and made another effort to show that they admitted their mistakes. But the Party demands from the old leaders of the right deviation not only that recognition of individual "mistakes" in the past, not only a formal statement that they agree with the Party line, but that they should strengthen these statements by a *struggle for the general Party lines*. The Party demands that they should keep in step with the Party, that they should have a proper perspective for the future. And for this purpose, Comrades Bukharin and Rykov must recognise that in the past they not only committed individual "mistakes," underestimating possibilities and overestimating difficulties, but that they

stubbornly struggled against the Party line, *against* Bolshevik tempos in industry, *against* the wide Socialist offensive, that previously their line was in practice a support of the kulaks, of the capitalist elements, and that they practically played the role of *agents of the kulaks in the Party*. They did not speak of this, while the explanations of Com. Bukharin at the Plenum regarding the theory of "organised capitalism" showed that they have not fully recognised it. From his explanations it is clear that Com. Bukharin does not even now see the close connection between his recently issued statement on "Organised Mismanagement" and the mistakes in his "Economics of the Transition Period" which were shown up by Lenin. Similarly, the statement of Com. Rykov is also not consistent with the full recognition of this fact, that he had recently fought for the Party line "as well as he could." In order to carry out his duties, the President of the Soviet of Peoples' Commissars, especially in the present situation of intense struggle, has to carry out his duties not only "as well as he can," but as well as is necessary.

It is clear that at the present time nobody holding such views can sit on the general staff of the Party or occupy a responsible position in the Soviet apparatus. For this reason, the Plenum released Comrade Rykov from his duties as a member of the Politbureau of the C.P.S.U., and co-opted Comrade Ordjonikidze. For this same reason, in place of Comrade Rykov, a tried and trustworthy Leninist, Comrade Molotov, was appointed to be president of the "Sovnarkom," whose appointment was met with great satisfaction by the whole proletariat of the U.S.S.R.

The December Plenum of the C.C. and the C.C.C. of the C.P.S.U., proved once more that the rudder of the Soviet ship is in firm and loyal hands, that the Central Committee of the Party and the Soviet Government will cope with those tasks which are raised by the decisive year, that they will be realised to the full and that the

foundation of the Socialist economy of the U.S.S.R. will be completed this year.

The firm advance of the millions of proletarians and collective farmers under the leadership of the steered Leninist Party, arouses fear and hate among the enemies of the Soviet Government, who are feverishly preparing for a war on the U.S.S.R. But this same firm advance also inspires with courage tens of millions of proletarians in the capitalist countries of the whole world, who are daily seeing more clearly that the only way out of the unheard-of crisis and the unprecedented unemployment, embracing now 30 million people, is but the same way as that adopted by the victorious proletariat of the land of the Soviets.

The task of the Communist Parties of capitalist countries is to point out to the masses of workers and peasants the lighthouse which is shining from the land of the Soviets, to direct their struggle against the attack of capital, along the only right path of October, exposing the lying demagogy of the fascists and social-fascists. The task of the Communist Parties is to show by examples from life that the C.P.S.U. is fighting for the victory of Socialism, winning position after position from the class enemy to demonstrate to them their future after the victory, to show how the proletariat is *really* doing away with capitalist exploitation, crises, unemployment. The task of the Communist Parties is to mobilise the masses of the international proletariat for the defence of the U.S.S.R., which is now engaged in laying the foundations of Socialist society.

Socialism in the U.S.S.R. is winning not only owing to the Socialist enthusiasm of the Soviet proletariat, but also owing to the struggle of the international proletariat, which assures for the U.S.S.R. a historical breathing space. Further victorious Socialist construction in the U.S.S.R. demands the same energy, the same great struggle of the international proletariat against the danger of foreign intervention which is threatening the Soviet Union.

TENDENCIES TOWARDS FASCISM IN GREAT BRITAIN

BY J. FINEBERG.

THE TREND TOWARDS FASCISM.

IN Great Britain the problem of Fascism is not yet as acute as it is in certain other capitalist countries. Nevertheless, during the past year, the trend towards Fascism has become more marked. More and more frequently and openly stress is being laid on the "extreme gravity" of the present situation in Great Britain, on the "inadequacy" of the ordinary forms of parliamentary government and on the necessity for a "non-Party" "national" Government with wide powers.

In the early part of the year the press barons, Beaverbrook and Rothermere, talked generally about Parliament being obsolete and about the necessity for a special body to deal with the solution of economic problems. Later in the year the Federation of British Industries passed a resolution declaring that—

"In this time of grave national peril, any measures and machinery aiming at the restoration of British industry should be treated as lying outside the realm of party conflict."

At about the same time, the National Council of Industry and Commerce was formed under the leadership of the automobile manufacturer, Sir William Morris, who, at the inaugural meeting of this body, talked of the need for a "strong Government."

Recently, Winston Churchill has more definitely advocated the formation of an "industrial sub-parliament" to deal with economic questions and finally, Oswald Mosley recently issued a manifesto which declares that it is impossible to meet the present economic crisis with a nineteenth century parliamentary machine and definitely calls for the appointment of an "Emergency Cabinet of Five" to be "invested with power to carry out an emergency policy subject only to the general control of Parliament." And even the Liberal and Free Trade "Economist" cannot "resist a feeling of sympathy for the underlying motive of the Mosley programme" and admits that "the inelasticity and inadaptability in our economic system . . . are also unfortunately the attributes of our administration and executive machinery."

The reason for this marked trend towards Fascism in Great Britain during the past year is

that the bourgeoisie can no longer conceal from itself and from the masses the glaring symptoms of Britain's decline. An eloquent confession of this is contained in a public statement issued by Sir Robert Horne and other members of the Conservative Party, in which they say that it cannot be disputed that Great Britain has lost the assets that gave her the lead as an industrial country; unemployment has become a chronic disease and is independent of the present world crisis, since certain staple industries must face the fact of a permanent decline.

Moreover, events during the past year have revealed the widening fissures in the British Empire. The Imperial Conference merely served to bring out more glaringly the growing antagonisms between the Dominions and Great Britain; while the Indian Round Table Conference, the convening of which was in itself a humiliating confession on the part of the British imperialists that the ties with India have become strained, has failed to stem the rising revolutionary struggle in that country. These glaring symptoms of the general crisis of British capitalism have thrown the British bourgeoisie into a state bordering on consternation. Never before has there been so much "introspection" and search for the causes of this decline and for means to stem it. But these researches merely reveal the inherent weaknesses and contradictions of British capitalism. Sir Arthur Salter, director of the economic section of the League of Nations, in a series of articles published in the "Times," emphasises the changed position of British economy in relation to world economy and gives as the reason that the British economic system suffers more from rigidity compared with that of competing countries. Having been first in the industrial field, Great Britain has passed from the pioneer stage to the heredity stage. Although bank capital has become greatly centralised, it does not serve industry in the same way as, say, German bank capital. Taxation and wages are, in the opinion of Sir Arthur, too high and trade union restrictions on methods of production are too rigid.

The problem is to find a remedy, but no remedy that has been suggested, or that can be suggested, except one, meets with the requirements of all sections of the bourgeoisie, and that is, the attack on the standard of living of the working-class. The conflict of interests among the various sections of the British bourgeoisie is strikingly brought out by the results of the work of a special secret committee set up by the Labour Government, composed of some of the foremost economists in England—Keynes, Sir Josiah Stamp, Professor Pigou, Professor Robbins and H. D. Henderson, to advise on a policy for checking the slump and to give the Government help on the question of tariffs. According to the "Manchester Guardian" the only proposal on which this committee was unanimous was that a reduction in the general level of wages is inevitable. As for the rest, no agreement could be reached. Keynes put forward a 10% revenue duty on imported manufactures to be used for a subsidy for exports. Sir Josiah Stamp was lukewarm towards the proposal, Robbins disagreed with it, while Pigou signed Keynes' memorandum as a whole, but under each paragraph wrote: "Professor Pigou dissents."

Although this has its comical side, it nevertheless shows the impasse which British economy has reached, the bankruptcy of the English economists in regard to suggesting remedies, and the cause of the severe conflict within the bourgeois parties. The situation is becoming desperate and demands are being made for desperate measures. The only way that appears open, that appears to offer some hope of Britain retaining her position as a capitalist power, is fundamentally to change the fiscal system upon which Britain's former might was built up and to adopt Protection as a means of retaining at least the Empire market and, by reducing the living standards of the workers, to reduce production costs, so as to be able to compete on the world market. The opposition of those sections of the bourgeoisie whose interests will be adversely affected by Protection must be overcome at all costs, while the standard of living of the working-class must be reduced, by peaceful means if possible—without incurring the loss that was caused by the struggles of 1926—but even at the cost of such a struggle, if it cannot be avoided. The growth of the elements

of the general crisis of capitalism have quickened the elements of Fascism in Great Britain. Hence the more marked manifestation of the trend towards Fascism observed at the present time.

THE ELEMENTS OF FASCISM.

So far, however, we do not see any rapid crystallisation of Fascism into a definite movement or organisation. The potentialities of such a movement undoubtedly exist and the elements of it are beginning to manifest themselves. Organisationally, the Fascist movement has so far manifested itself in three bodies: the Beaverbrook-Rothermere Empire Crusade and United Empire Party; the National Council of Industry and Commerce, formed on the initiative of Sir William Morris; and the Mosley group in the Labour Party.

The first of these sprang up as a result of the conflict in the Conservative Party over the question of tariffs, and for a time it seemed that it would develop into a separate, extremely reactionary movement, although from the very beginning, a split occurred in its ranks. While numerically, it represented only a small fraction of the Conservative Party, nevertheless, the Paddington by-elections showed that it could rally the support of a considerable number of the bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeoisie. However, since the Conservative Party has taken a more definite stand on the question of tariffs, and particularly on the question of duties on imported foodstuffs, the "revolt" seems to have subsided.

The National Council of Industry and Commerce was formed in September, 1930, for the purpose of carrying on propaganda and educational work to promote a movement in favour of a change in the fiscal system "for the mutual advantage of the nations of the British Commonwealth," and of a reduction in taxation as a "means for restoring prosperity to industry and agriculture." The organisation, it is claimed, is economic rather than political, and therefore it appeals to members of all parties. But of significance is its special appeal to the workers. In the speeches delivered at the inaugural meeting of this organisation it was stated that: The National Council of Industry was going to try to get workers to join them.

They were going to organise meetings of work-people and to explain to them in simple language the present difficulties and to prove to them that Protection means full employment. They proposed to establish locals for propaganda and educational purposes and seek the co-operation of trade unions.

So far, however, there has been no evidence of this activity, either generally or among the workers.

It is not quite clear what numerical strength the Mosley group represents. The Mosley manifesto was signed by seventeen Labour Members of Parliament, including five members of the Independent Labour Party, and also by A. J. Cook of the Miners' Federation. It also had the public (if veiled) support of Bevin of the Transport Workers' Union. It is claimed that Mosley has considerable support among the trade union bureaucracy, but concrete evidence of this, except for the cases named, has not been forthcoming so far. Nevertheless, the evident signs of his popularity that were evinced at the Llandudno Labour Party Conference must not be ignored.

The question as to what extent these Fascist elements will develop further and coalesce into a definitely Fascist movement will depend on the one hand upon how the political crisis develops—the extent to which the antagonisms among the bourgeoisie become more intensified or allayed—and on the other hand, upon the extent to which the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat becomes more intensified.

In view of the intensification of the general situation, British capitalism is proposing a new "untried" method that offers, or appears to offer, a way out of the present situation, and that is the way of Protection. It is this question that gave rise to the conflicts in the bourgeois political parties and stimulated the Fascist elements. Although the conflict on this question is still acute, nevertheless, there is no evidence that it is so acute, that the respective sides are so evenly balanced and an agreement so remote as to call for drastic action on the part of one side to overcome the other. A regrouping of forces is taking place among the bourgeoisie on this question. The acuteness of the crisis and the impasse which British capitalism has reached in her development on the basis of

the old fiscal system are causing many former adherents of free trade to waver and to clutch at the "desperate" remedy of Protection as the only way out. The assertions made by Liberal authorities, for example, Lloyd George, that they are not bound to free trade, are indicative of this. The preponderance of strength is undoubtedly swinging over to the side of the Protectionists, and all the evidence indicates the possibility of this controversy in Great Britain being solved for the time being within the framework of the party system and of parliamentarism.

This, however, does not settle the question of the prospects of the development of Fascism in the event of a sharp intensification of the class struggle arising from the general attack on the standard of living of the working-class, upon the necessity for which the whole of the bourgeoisie is unanimous as the essential pre-requisite for any remedy that may be applied to solve the economic crisis. Given such a development there will, of course, be a rapid concentration of Fascist forces and transition to the open dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

However, while the bourgeoisie is determined to carry out its plan for lowering the standard of living of the working-class, it would prefer to achieve this without serious disturbance of the economic machine, for undoubtedly a repetition of the menacing events of 1926, in present conditions, would be a severe blow to British economy.

For the past two years the bourgeoisie has carried on an offensive against the working-class adopting the methods of "attrition," of nibbling away at the workers' conditions in separate enterprises in a given industry preparatory to a general attack in that industry, as was the case in the cotton and woollen industries. Now they are going over to the general offensive against the working-class, the opening of which is marked by the attack on the miners, railwaymen, and cotton weavers.

During this period we have also seen the growing militancy of the workers and their readiness to resist the capitalist offensive. But without exception this resistance has been broken by the treachery of the trade union bureaucracy, and the worsening of conditions has been achieved by the arbitration policy of the Labour Government. The task before the bourgeoisie

is to continue to secure the fulfilment of these manoeuvres.

Why have these manoeuvres been successful up to now? Because the workers, in the main, followed the leadership of the trade union bureaucracy and the Labour Party. The workers had confidence in their trade union leaders and continued to hope that a Labour Government would save them from wage-cuts, or at all events would be able to improve economic conditions so as to compensate for them in some way. But disillusionment is spreading among the workers and they are seeking another way out. To some extent this disillusionment is finding expression in the swing-over of a section of the workers to the bourgeois parties, as a result of the demagoguery which these parties have spread in connection with the question of protection. But we must not ignore the huge votes Labour Party candidates still obtain at elections. This shows that the British workers are loath to abandon their Party, which they have built up only in recent years in opposition to the capitalist parties. The workers themselves are in an impasse.

Herein lies precisely the significance of the Mosley manifesto. From within the Labour Party comes the offer of a drastic solution of the present acute situation which, on the surface, does not appear to call for any sacrifices on the part of the working-class. Such a programme might revive the confidence of the workers in the Labour Party and thus keep them tied to the social-fascist machine. The most striking feature of the Mosley manifesto is its sheer bluff and demagoguery, the sharp and striking manner in which it sums up the acuteness of the present situation and the bold, drastic, and, at the same time, plausible proposals made for solving the crisis and ushering in prosperity in the immediate future. The following is a brief summary of the manifesto:—

The nation is faced with a crisis, which, unless decisive action is taken, threatens the nation with disaster. To meet the situation a policy is required more drastic than has yet been proposed by any Government hitherto.

The present parliamentary form is inadequate to cope with the situation. An Emergency Cabinet of Five to be set up with power to carry out an emergency policy subject only to the general control of Parliament.

The complete rationalisation of the economy of the country on the basis of planned economy.

The home market to be the future basis of British trade. This requires higher purchasing power. Hence, wages must be raised to the highest level.

This will be possible if British industry is protected from competition from countries with a lower civilisation. Hence the necessity for controlling imports and for introducing tariffs.

Protection by tariffs, however, to be given only to those industries which are run efficiently, sell their commodities at low prices, and pay high wages (!!).

Agreement with the Dominions on the basis of preference for imports of foodstuffs in exchange for British manufactured goods.

Purchase of foodstuffs from foreign countries only if they import in exchange for British manufactured goods.

Large capital expenditure on constructive works, particularly on housing. "Housing should be turned out in the same way as munitions were turned out during the war."

The removal of some of the burdens on food and prime necessities of the working-class. Further relief in this respect to be given when industry has recovered sufficiently.

Reduction in taxation on the "hard-earned incomes of the skilled, technical and managerial workers by whose labour and organising ability industry is conducted."

Postponement of the repayment of the war debt.

Socialism is simply dropped. "The immediate question," says the manifesto, "is not a question of ownership but of the survival of British industry," and it concludes:

"The country cannot wait; above all, the working class cannot wait. In the face of the almost universal attack on wages and standard of life with which they are being threatened in the present situation, we want action now to meet the national emergency."

This plausible offer of good trade, high wages and low prices, with its sugar-coated plea for tariffs on imports, all to be achieved in a peaceful manner except for a "temporary" suspension of "democracy," is well calculated to win the support of the working-class, especially if it is supported by an important body of Labour leaders.

The further development of this movement will be determined by the manner in which the Labour Party reacts to the Mosley manifesto. If the Labour Party definitely opposes the Mosley programme, and if its opposition goes to the extent of the Mosley group breaking away from the Labour Party, or of it being expelled, then the probability is that it will link up with the Fascist elements outside of the Labour Party, the more so that Mosley appeals to all classes and declares his readiness to co-operate with all classes. In this connection, Sir William Morris' approval of the Mosley manifesto and his statement that it gives concrete evidence of the possibility of the foundation of a vigorous industrial party is significant.

It is by no means certain, however, that the Labour Party will entirely reject the Mosley

programme. The leadership of the Labour Party is well aware of a growing discontent within the Party and of the demand for bold measures to meet the crisis. On the question of tariffs the Labour Party is divided, as are the other capitalist Parties, and the pronouncement of the General Council of the Trade Union Congress in favour of Protection must have a considerable effect in determining the ultimate policy of the Labour Party on this question. The editorial comment of the "Daily Herald," the organ of the Labour Party, on the Mosley manifesto quite clearly indicates that the Labour Party leadership by no means regards that manifesto as something totally unacceptable. The "Daily Herald" said:—

"To exaggerate or to minimise Sir Oswald Mosley's manifesto would be a mistake. Right or wrong, it is a sincere effort to formulate a policy to meet the present emergency and should be judged on its merits."

It opposes the "War Cabinet" idea, but as to tariffs—

"it would be a profound mistake to suppose that the Labour Party is tied to Cobdenism in its narrowest form. For the sake of an economic formula, labour will not allow British standards to be degraded by cheap coolie conditions in other parts of the world."

After warning Mosley against the influence of Beaverbrook, and calling upon him to dissociate himself from him, the "Daily Herald" concludes by saying:—

"Labour is quite ready to give a fair and impartial hearing to new proposals—but will reject forcibly anything that tends towards Coalition."

This indicates that, far from the Labour Party leadership commencing a campaign against the Mosley programme, it is highly probable that it will adopt it, perhaps in a modified form, as a means of rehabilitating itself with the mass of the workers. Although the "Daily Herald" objects to the idea of an "Emergency Cabinet," the Labour Government in fact supplied this proposal in principle when it came into office by appointing J. H. Thomas as Minister in charge of Unemployment with special powers.

The attitude of the "Left Wing" of Social-Fascism towards Mosley's Fascist programme is also instructive. One would expect that the leadership of the Independent Labour Party would immediately rise in arms against this programme. But this has not happened. On the contrary, five members of the I.L.P. signed the Mosley manifesto, including W. J. Brown, the most "revolutionary" of the I.L.P. group in the House of Commons. Feeble objections

have been made to the Mosley programme by Fenner Brockway and Maxton.

The National Council of the I.L.P. discussed the manifesto at one of its meetings, at which the unanimous opinion was expressed, according to the "New Leader," that the manifesto was contrary to the principles of Socialism and internationalism, for which the I.L.P. stood.

Nevertheless, a resolution that was moved at the meeting of the N.A.C. of the I.L.P., proposing to dissociate the I.L.P. from the Mosley manifesto, and asking for explanations from the members of the I.L.P. Parliamentary Group who supported it, was defeated by seven votes to three.

Meanwhile, the Mosley group are attempting to tone down some of the unpalatable parts of their manifesto in order to remove criticism from various sides. In a statement to the Press, W. J. Brown, on behalf of the group, denied that it aimed at a "dictatorship"; its proposal left the "sovereignty of Parliament" intact; it was merely a means for expediting the carrying out of measures for solving the crisis. It did not propose the repudiation of the war debt in any shape or form. All it proposed was that the payments to the Sinking Fund of the debt should be reduced. The proposals for Protection were in line with the Labour policy of restricting competition from sweated industries. Replying to the I.L.P., Brown said that their (I.L.P.) programme was to bring in Socialism in twenty-five years, "but wholesale attacks on the standard of life of the workers—miners, railwaymen, cotton operatives—are here now. What is to be done about it?"

It is clear that an effort is to be made to find a basis upon which Social-Fascism of all shades can accept this Fascist programme as a means of keeping the masses of the workers tied to the Social-Fascist machine in order that it may continue to fulfil its Social-fascist function. This is practically admitted in so many words by W. J. Brown in an article in the "New Leader" in which he contrasts the three positions in British politics to-day: (1) the position of the orthodox parliamentary parties, which he describes as "uninspired, unintelligent caretaking for capitalism"; (2) the position of the Communist Party "which frankly declares that the new social order cannot be brought into being through the instruments of the old and which looks to social

collapse to release the forces which alone can lead to the establishment of the new order"; and (3) the position of "practical opportunism" of the I.L.P., which has led to nothing. If this situation continues, he said, the Labour movement will face disaster at the next election. He therefore appeals to the I.L.P. to join the Mosley group in order to save the situation.

Thus, the object of the Mosley programme is to avert the "disaster" which threatens the Labour Party at the next election, and not only that, but to avert the menace that may threaten the "institutions of parliamentary government itself." Its object is to serve as a lightning conductor for diverting the accumulating discontent and militancy of the working-class.

By adopting the Mosley programme, the Labour Party would not be converted into a Fascist Party. It would only be fulfilling its "legitimate" Fascist role in the present situation. The position is that since the Labour Party still commands the support of large masses of the workers, its formal opposition to Protection would restrain the workers from accepting it. By adopting Protection, particularly in the demagogic guise of discriminating against "sweated goods," it will swing the workers over to the side of this imperialist programme, while at the same time appearing to fight the capitalist parties. Furthermore, assuming that a General Election will take place in the near future, there is no certainty that any party will obtain an absolute majority. If no party obtains a majority, the question of a "National" or Coalition Government will certainly come up as an urgent practical issue. The Mosley programme will have prepared the ground for such a Coalition. Thus, British Social-Fascism further develops its function of binding the working-class to the chariot of the bourgeois dictatorship.

THE TASKS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY.

The question is, will British Social-Fascism succeed in carrying out this manoeuvre? The whole question rests upon the issue of providing the workers with an alternative leadership, of rallying and organising them for the struggle against the capitalist offensive. The probability of the success of the Mosley programme lies precisely in the growing disillusionment of the workers in the present leadership of the Labour

Party and their desire for a bold lead that offers a way out of the present situation. The task, of the Communist Party, therefore, is firstly: to expose the humbug and demagoguery of this programme and prove to the workers that it is merely the programme of the capitalist offensive in a cloaked form; secondly, the Party must present to the workers its own programme in such a way as to bring out as strikingly and clearly as does the Mosley programme the present critical state of British capitalism and the need for drastic action, with this difference, of course, that it must show that the only drastic measure that can be of any avail in the present situation is organised mass struggle; thirdly, these mass struggles must be organised. In short, the Party must provide the alternative, militant leadership which the workers are seeking.

The Party press treated the publication of the Mosley manifesto with too much restraint and in a very feeble way. Since its publication, several articles criticising it have appeared in the "Daily Worker," but this is far from being adequate. While it is correct not to adopt a panicky attitude towards the Mosley programme, it would nevertheless be a grave mistake to underestimate it. The programme must be taken up point by point and its real significance for the workers clearly and simply explained.

As against the Mosley programme, the Charter programme must be developed into a manifesto on the same lines as the Mosley manifesto, written in a style that will bring home to the workers the "gravity" of the situation for the working-class, that will convince the workers that only independent action can avert "disaster" and that will present the Charter demands in such a way as really to serve as a means for rallying the workers for the struggle. The formula must be found by which the demands in the Charter can be linked up with the struggle against the capitalist offensive and against the capitalist system. This has not been done yet. The Charter is still being advanced as some magic "shibboleth" that is immediately to open the eyes of the workers and cause them to flock to the banner of the Party. A characteristic example of how the Party press talks about the Charter instead of explaining it, is provided by the "Daily Worker" of Dec. 18th. The leading article in that issue, entitled "Capitalism or Socialism," criticises the Mosley programme

and the pronouncements of other Fascist groups and states that, "as the Soviet Union has proved, planned economy is only possible after the overthrow and suppression of capitalism," and immediately, without further explanation, goes on to say:—

"In the fight for the overthrow of capitalism, the Charter campaign is of the greatest importance, and must be used to mobilise the workers around the live issues that confront them day by day. Through this campaign we can gather strength and organisation. Above all, we can get the experience of day-to-day fighting and struggle that is absolutely essential for the building of a workers' army equal to the great historic task that lies before it."

It would not be so bad if the above were addressed to the Party members, but even they must stand in need of some further explanation of the Charter. It is obvious, however, that the general reader of the paper cannot learn from this what relation the Charter campaign has to the day-to-day struggle and to the struggle for the overthrow and suppression of capitalism.

Much more attention must be given to propaganda showing the inherent contradictions of capitalism as the cause of the present economic

crisis, and proving the necessity for overthrowing capitalism. Almost every day, British economists in the bourgeois press provide material on the "paradox of impoverishment arising out of plenty" (Salter), on "over-production causing unemployment," on "surplus production capacity," followed by the demand for "more rationalisation," all of which could be used as "texts" for propaganda to prove the bankruptcy of capitalism and the need for struggle against the capitalist offensive, for the demands of the Charter, and against the capitalist system itself. This is entirely neglected. It must be said that it is left to the Fascists to sound the "alarm" about the impending doom of capitalism, and they do so in order to rally the workers to save it.

A proper approach to the whole question of the economic crisis will render it possible to present the Charter to the workers and to conduct the Charter campaign in such a way as to rally the masses of the workers and in this way counteract Fascist propaganda and defeat the manoeuvres of the Social-Fascists.

THE PROBLEM OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE WORLD ECONOMIC CRISIS INTO A POLITICAL CRISIS

BY A. MARTYNOV.

LENIN ON POLITICAL CRISES.

LENIN gave the *methodological* prerequisites for solving the problem of political crises. In his pamphlet "Left Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder," Lenin formulated the "fundamental law of the revolution" as follows:

"Only when the '*masses*' do not want the old regime, and when the '*governing classes*' are unable to govern as of old, then only can the revolution succeed. This truth may be expressed in other words: Revolution is impossible without an all-national crisis, affecting both the exploited and the exploiters." (1928 ed., p. 65).

Lenin identified such an "all-national crisis" with a revolutionary situation. Regarding the conditions leading to a national crisis, i.e., a revolutionary situation, Lenin wrote to the same effect still earlier in 1915, in his article "The Collapse of the Second International":

"What are generally speaking the characteristics of a revolutionary situation? We will probably not be mistaken when we indicate the following three outstanding signs: (1) It is impossible for the ruling classes to maintain their power unchanged; there is a crisis 'higher up' taking one form or another; there is a crisis in the policy of the ruling class, as a result there

appears a crack through which the dissatisfaction and revolt of the oppressed classes bursts forth. If a revolution is to take place, it is usually insufficient that 'one does not work way below,' but it is necessary that 'one is incapable up above' to continue in the old way. (2) The wants and sufferings of the oppressed classes become more acute than usual. (3) In consequence of the above causes there is a considerable increase in the activity of the masses, who in 'peace' times allow themselves to be robbed without protest, but in stormy times are drawn, both by the circumstances of the crises and also by the '*higher ups*' themselves, into independent historic action." (Lenin "Works," Vol. XVIII., p. 273.)

Such are the *objective* signs of a revolutionary situation. Are these objective signs sufficient for the outbreak of a revolution! No, says Lenin:

"A revolution emerges not out of every revolutionary situation, but out of such situation where to the above-mentioned objective changes subjective ones are added, namely, the ability of the revolutionary classes to carry out revolutionary mass actions *strong enough* to break (or undermine) the old government, it being the rule that never, not even in a period of crises, does a government 'fall' of itself without being 'helped to fall'." (Ibid., pp. 279-280.)

Depending upon the ripeness or unripeness of this subjective factor—the "ability of the

revolutionary class to carry out revolutionary mass actions *powerful enough* . . ." we see in history revolutionary situations which have resulted in revolution or which have not resulted in such :

"This situation existed in 1905 in Russia (when the revolution 'undermined' the government A.M.), and in all the periods of revolution in the West; but it also, existed in the seventh decade of last century in Germany it existed in 1859-1861, and in 1879-1880 in Russia, though there was no revolution in these latter instances." (Ibid., p. 279.)

However, even for the development of a revolutionary situation which does not result in revolution because of the unripeness of the subjective factor, it is necessary, *in addition to a crisis in the governing classes*, to have a certain degree of intensification of poverty, of revolutionary dissatisfaction and revolutionary activity, of the oppressed classes. For instance, it is necessary that the masses be induced "both by the entire situation of crisis, as well as by the governing classes, to independent historical action," as was the case in Germany in the 'sixties of last century, when the Lassalean movement arose, or that there be "inarticulate indignation of the masses," "a beginning of dissatisfaction" in the "masses," as was the case in 1915 when, to use Lenin's words, there was also a "revolutionary situation" (see *ibid.*, p. 141), or that there be a revolutionary upsurge of an "all-national character." Lenin saw the *commencement* of such an all-national revolutionary upsurge for instance in the revolutionary strikes of the Russian workers in 1912 for "only that movement is all-national which expresses the objective requirements of the whole country, directing its heavy blows against the central forces of the enemy, which hinders the development of the country." (Lenin "Works," Vol. XVI., "The Growth of Revolutionary Strikes and Street Demonstrations.")

Such are the conditions necessary and sufficient for a revolutionary situation, but insufficient for a revolution. However, Lenin also analysed political crises, which whilst being very deep-going *crises of the ruling circles*, nevertheless still lacked the character of national political crises, and hence, did not create a revolutionary situation. He analysed one such crisis in his article "Results and Significance of the Presidential Elections in America," written

in 1912. According to Lenin these elections marked a "*profound crisis of the bourgeois parties*,"

"The old parties ('democratic' and 'republican' A.M.), were given birth to by an epoch whose task was the speediest development of capitalism. The struggle of the parties consisted in how best to speed up and facilitate this development. The new party ('National Progressive Party' of Roosevelt.—A.M.), has been given birth to by the present-day epoch, which brings up the question of the very existence of capitalism."

The progress of this new four-million strong party consisted of the following :

"We will save capitalism through reforms . . . we will give the most advanced factory legislation. We will introduce State control over *all* trusts. . . We will introduce State control over these trusts so that there should be no poverty, so that all receive a 'fair' wage. We will establish 'social and industrial justice.' We swear fidelity to all reforms . . . there is only '*one reform*' we do not want : *expropriation of the capitalists*." (Lenin "Works," Vol. XVI., "The results and meaning of the Presidential Elections in America.")

Lenin gave us another instance of a political crisis which had not created a revolutionary situation in his article "The Constitutional Crisis in England." In 1914 a "general constitutional" crisis arose in England in the following conditions: the Conservatives threatened an uprising of Protestants in Ulster against the autonomy of Ireland, against Home Rule. The Liberal Government despatched some troops in order to enforce the will of Parliament. In reply, the generals and officers of the British troops went on strike. As a result the Liberal Government gave way to the officers, giving them a written assurance that the troops would not be used against Ulster. On this head Lenin said :

"March 21st, 1914, will be a date of world historical change, when the lords and landlords of England, having smashed the English constitution and the English laws, gave an admirable lesson of the class struggle." (Lenin, Vol. XVII., "The Constitutional Crisis in England.")

Lenin ascribed to both of these crises immense importance. Nevertheless in neither case did he speak of a revolutionary situation. What was lacking in these cases for the creation of a revolutionary situation? There was no *revolutionary* activity or even *revolutionary* dissatisfaction of the broad working masses, there was no "crisis among the masses." In the first case, writing on the big victory gained by Roosevelt at the elections, Lenin said :

" . . . The American working-class has already awakened, and stands at its post. It greets Roosevelt's success with cheerful irony.—You have attracted four million people with your promises of reforms, dear

charlatan Roosevelt! Fine! To-morrow these four millions will see that your promises are a fraud—these millions follow you *only* because they feel that it is *impossible* to live as of old.” (Lenin “Works,” Vol. XVI., “The Results and Meaning of the Presidential Elections in America.”)

Here we see that the “American working-class has already awakened,” but as far as the elections was concerned, this was expressed as yet only in its meeting Roosevelt’s successes with “cheerful irony,” while that part of the working-class already felt that it was impossible to continue living as of old; *to-day* it allowed itself to be drawn away by the promises made by the charlatan Roosevelt; only *to-morrow* will it understand that these promises are a fraud.

A similar case took place during the constitutional crisis in Britain in 1914. The Liberals did not dare to come out determinedly against the Conservatives, who had infringed the constitution, by appealing to the masses, because it was *no longer* possible “to blunt the sharpness of the contradictions between the working-class and the bourgeoisie of Britain with the halfway, hypocritical, the feigned reformist policy of the Liberals.” Despite the acuteness of these contradictions, however, *at that time*, the workers had not yet outlived their constitutional illusions. The Ulster lesson was to help them in this. That, though, was but the work of *the morrow*:

“The working-class will soon discard its Philistine belief in this paper, called the English Law and Constitution, which before the eyes of the whole people has been torn up by the English aristocrats.” (Lenin “Works,” Vol. XVII., “The Constitutional Crisis in England.”)

Thus we see that Lenin held that there were three stages of development in the revolutionary process: the political crisis of the rulers, without yet giving rise to a crisis of the masses; the national political crisis, i.e., the revolutionary situation; and, finally, the revolution. These three phases have no Chinese Wall separating them; one phase develops into the other more or less rapidly, depending upon the historical situation, and the entire totality of conditions in the given country at the given time must be analysed in order to determine which of these phases is being passed through. At the same time we see that the *degree of development of the movement of the revolutionary class* (in modern conditions, the movement of the proletariat in capitalist countries, the movement of the proletariat and peasantry in colonial and

semi-colonial countries) is of *decisive importance* in determining the phase of development of the revolutionary process.

The political crisis of the ruling classes, the national political crisis or revolutionary situation, and, finally, the revolution, represent the three phases of the revolutionary process. These three phases *usually* followed each other in history. (Instances: the great French revolution started with a crisis of the upper classes; the Russian revolution of 1905 started with the “Liberal spring” of Svyatopolk-Mirsky; the February revolution of 1917 was also preceded by a crisis of the ruling class during Rasputinism). This is easily understood. According to Lenin, a crisis of the ruling classes “creates a breach through which the dissatisfaction and indignation of the oppressed classes pours forth.” And subsequently, when a revolutionary situation is created, there is effected the “rapid tenfold increase or even hundredfold increase in the number of representatives of the toiling and oppressed masses, hitherto apathetic, but capable of participating in the political struggle.” This, however, by no means implies that a *short cut*—the fusion of the second and third phases, or the first and second phases into one phase is impossible. Instances: In February, 1917, the revolutionary situation in Russia immediately resulted in revolution; the same was the case in Germany in November, 1918. On the other hand, the General Strike in Great Britain in 1926, the July uprising in Vienna in 1927 and the September movement in Hungary in 1930, show that a sudden revolutionary upsurge is quite possible even without a sharply expressed crisis of the ruling classes.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE ECONOMIC CRISIS INTO A POLITICAL, AND IN PLACES, INTO A NATIONAL POLITICAL CRISIS.

If we go further, and from the Leninist methodological standpoint appraise the political situation which now obtains in the various countries in connection with the world economic crisis, which is intensified as the result of the general crisis of capitalism, we find an extremely *heterogeneous* picture. This picture shows, however, a *general tendency for the rapid growth of elements of a crisis of the masses and a crisis of the ruling-classes*; for the rapid growth of revolutionary forces on the one hand, and on the other

hand, for the extreme acceleration of the process of fascisation of the State, the weakening or collapse and fascisation of the bourgeois and social-democratic parties, and in places, to the stormy growth of open fascism.

Whilst the crisis of the ruling classes in those countries where Fascism has been in power for long and has already exposed itself (Italy, Poland) is expressed in the narrowing social basis of Fascism, in most of the so-called "democratic" countries the crisis of the upper classes most clearly expresses itself precisely, in the collapse of the old parliamentary bourgeois parties, in their regroupings, in their fascisation, in the growth of open Fascism and the extension of the social basis for Fascism at the expense of the petty bourgeoisie who are deserting the old bourgeois parties or who were formerly politically passive.

The revolutionisation of the masses, on the one hand, and fascisation on the other, represent a general tendency, but against this background we observe great *variety* in the various countries as regards the *degree, the phase of development*, of the political crisis.

We see, depending upon the inequality of the economic and political development and upon the varying positions of the countries—victorious country or vanquished, sovereign or vassal State, metropolis or colony, a strongly welded State or colonial empire being disintegrated by internal contradictions—depending upon all this—that the *various countries at the present time are passing through the various phases of the revolutionary process at an accelerated rate.*

In some cases (Germany and Poland) the economic crisis has already developed into a *political crisis* which has gone very far forward. In both the one and the other we have a crisis of the ruling classes, *although expressed varyingly*. In both the one and the other country, however, we also have a rapid growth of the elements making for a crisis among the masses, which is also expressed differently.

Already at the time of the Reichstag elections the *crisis of the ruling classes* in Germany was expressed in all the old openly bourgeois parties (with the exception of the Centre Party), suffering a big defeat, in the serious defeat sustained for the first time for a long period even by the Social Democratic Party, in the great growth of the Fascists ("National Socialists"). After the

parliamentary elections this crisis of the upper classes was intensified: the "democrats" liquidated their party and formed a more right wing "State Party." The "German People's Party" together with the "Economic Party," opposed collaboration with the social-democracy. The "Centre Party" intends to combine with the extreme right wing "Bavarian National Party." The Fascists ("National Socialists"), again gained big victories in Eastern Prussia, Danzig, Baden, Bremen and Mecklenburg. Brüning's predatory programme is carried, as an emergency ukase, infringing the constitution. In general the whole of the bourgeoisie *firmly follows the line of carrying out this programme by all possible means*, and if the proletariat shows resistance, to suppress the revolutionary labour movement by force and set up an open Fascist dictatorship. Fascist methods of rule greatly extend, the danger of a Fascist dictatorship grows, but this process has not yet been completed, there is as yet no open Fascist dictatorship in Germany, the possibility or impossibility of its establishment to be decided in the process of our struggle against the bourgeoisie in Germany.

Parallel with this there rapidly grow the *elements of a crisis among the masses*. At the Reichstag elections, and later at the municipal elections, this was expressed in the *mutually sharp*, internally contradictory (and by no means synonymous!) process, in which the million-strong masses of the urban petty bourgeoisie (who formerly mostly followed the openly bourgeois parties), and the most backward strata of the proletariat, for instance, the agricultural labourers, who were formerly politically passive, now, feeling that it is impossible to live as of old, and finding no real way out of the position, seek salvation in counter-revolutionary Fascism, in whose charlatan promises they still believe to-day, but in which they will cease to believe to-morrow if we pursue a skilful tactic and conduct energetic work. The elements of the growth of a crisis among the masses, in a *synonymous, revolutionary manifestation*, are seen in that 4½ million workers vote for the Communist Party, for the slogan of Soviet Germany, that for the first time since 1923, in conditions when unemployment is terribly rampant, a strike has broken out of 130,000 metal workers, that the workers at their demonstrations conduct

a heroic struggle for the streets, entering into fights with the armed forces of the police and the Fascists, that the social-democratic workers are *beginning* to rebel openly against their party, and though *to-day* they do not yet make up their minds to go over direct to the Communists, they will decide upon this *to-morrow if we conduct an elastic tactic and energetic work.*

In Fascist Poland, as distinguished from "democratic" Germany, the *crisis of the upper classes* is expressed not in a crisis of parliamentarism, but in the disintegration of the Fascist dictatorship and in its narrowing social basis. On the eve of the elections this was expressed in the intensification of the friction inside the Fascist camp between the Pilsudski-ites on the one hand, and the "People's Democracy" and the "Centre Left" on the other hand, in the desertion of a number of elements from the Pilsudski-ites (Czechowski, former minister of Finances, Bojko's peasant group, with the exception of the leader, the "Union of Democratic Legionaires"). During the elections the Pilsudski-ites, by applying terror, succeeded in disorganising their opponents in the Fascist camp, in scaring the petty bourgeois masses, and thereby in somewhat strengthening their front. This, however, was for a very short space of time and to a very slight degree. Even this forced election was unable to conceal the fact that passing from East to West, i.e., from the districts of the maximum terror to the districts of relatively least terror, even the official number of votes for the Pilsudski-ites steadily melted, reaching 50% in the central voievodstvos (provinces), 30% in Western Silesia, and 20% in Posen and the "Polish corridor."

The growth of the elements of a *crisis among the masses* in Poland is expressed in the general revolutionary influx, in the practically equal radicalisation of the workers and the peasant masses, in the numerous workers' demonstrations, in the fact that during one year only unemployed demonstrations in seventy towns were dispersed by armed force, in the fact that the peasants are resisting taxation impositions, in the fact that fires have already occurred in Western Ukraina.

As the result, we have in Germany and Poland such a political crisis which may rapidly develop into a national crisis, i.e., into a revolutionary situation, if the rate of growth in the activities of

our Communist Party does not lag behind the rate of development of events.

In other instances (first of all in India, and then in the countries of Latin America, and in Europe, in Spain), we already have a *revolutionary situation*, which, however, at *the present time* is unable to develop into a workers' and peasants' democratic, victorious revolution, which in these countries stands on the order of the day, as Communist Parties are only beginning to be formed in these countries, and as without a Communist Party the hegemony of the proletariat—the essential prerequisite for such a democratic revolution—cannot be carried out. As distinguished from the first post-war revolutionary wave, the revolutionary upsurge in India is not emanating from the working-class. The revolutionary struggle itself has now been raised to a far higher level than it reached during the first wave, and as regards the *methods of the struggle* has gone far beyond the limits which the national bourgeoisie desired to set. However, the revolutionary movement has not yet broken with the leaders of the National Congress and has not yet put forward its own revolutionary programme of demands as distinct from those limited demands and objects which were put forward by the national bourgeoisie: (1) the salt campaign, (2) the anti-alcohol campaign; (3) the boycott of foreign goods; (4) "non-collaboration"; (5) non-payment of taxes, etc. There is an undoubted revolutionary situation in India, but the movement there has come up against the problem of the proletariat winning the hegemony, and the closely connected problem of the crystallisation of a mass Communist Party in the process of the struggle.

In the Latin-American countries the movement is on a still lower plane. True, in 1930 alone there were two revolutions in Peru, one in Bolivia, one in Argentina, and there was martial law in Cuba. But these are by no means democratic revolutions, they are still inspired by the U.S.A., and to no slight degree are a tool of American imperialism in its struggle with Britain for hegemony.

As regards Spain, where there is also a revolutionary situation, although there is a stormy labour movement, it is still for the most part of a spontaneous character, is only to a slight degree directed by the Communist Party, whilst the bourgeois republicans opposing

General Berengera put as their chief object the salvation of capitalism in Spain.

In the third case (China) we have a real democratic plebeian *revolution* with the establishment of the power of the Soviets. The revolution in China, however, is as yet limited only to a certain part of the country's territory—to a part where there are no big industrial centres—as it has to contend against the iron barrier of the united military forces of the imperialists.

Besides this there are a number of countries where at the present time there is no political crisis yet, but where the elements making for a crisis of the upper classes and the element making for a crisis among the masses are maturing. As examples we can cite the present situation in "democratic" Britain and in Fascist Italy.

In Britain the bourgeoisie fully realise that the danger of an acute political crisis is facing the country. The Liberal "Manchester Guardian" notes that the situation in Britain is so serious that the attempts of the Labour Government to "solve the secondary sores of society" are powerless to prevent the great danger threatening the State. On the other hand, the Conservative Churchill already notes the insolvency of parliamentarism in Britain. In accordance with this there are maturing the *elements making for a crisis of the upper classes*: strengthening of the Fascist and Protectionist tendencies, the secession of the Beaverbrook group from the Conservatives, the adoption of a protectionist position by Baldwin under the pressure of the opposition in the Conservative Party, differentiation amongst the Liberals (Simon's protest against supporting the Labour Party), differentiation in the Labour Party, the appearance of Mosley's influential figure, characterised by the bourgeois press as the future Hitler of England.

Side by side with this we see in England a gradual growth of the *elements of a crisis among the masses*. In the working-class of that country we observe a double-sided process. On the one hand the trade union leaders, reflecting the mood of the labour aristocracy, are increasingly turning to the right and tending towards protectionism, and at the last municipal elections the Labour Party lost votes, partially to the Liberals, but chiefly to the Conservatives. On the other hand, we have such facts as the

Bradford woollen strike, as the shouting down of Lansbury at the meeting in Whitechapel and Thomas at another meeting, as the miners' strike in Scotland, as the manifest growth of militancy among the railwaymen.

In Fascist Italy, as in Poland, the *elements of the crisis of the upper classes* manifest themselves otherwise than in "democratic" countries, and are seen, not in the strengthening of Fascism, but in the commencement of the disintegration of the Fascist dictatorship; unreliability and drop in discipline of the Fascist militia; loss of 200,000 votes by the Fascist youth league; the tendency among the big bourgeoisie to disband the Fascist Party; and as a reaction to the narrowing social basis of Fascism, the activation of social-fascism, the formation of the organisation for "right and justice," etc.

Parallel with this, and partially under the influence of the growth of elements making for a crisis of the ruling classes, but chiefly, of course, in connection with the economic and agrarian crisis, we see in Italy likewise the *growth of elements making for a crisis among the masses*. Workers' and peasants' unrests grow more frequent, and these are hotbeds throughout the country. "The unrests occur incessantly, at times acquiring the character of uprisings, and in some circumstances as in Venice-Julia, the character of unceasing partisan wars."

Thus we see that along with the intensification of the economic and agrarian crisis, various countries are now passing through various phases of the revolutionary process. It would, however, be an entirely mechanistic theory if we were to maintain that those countries which are now passing through the earlier phase will arrive at the historical "finish," at revolution, later, or on the contrary, that in those countries which are now passing through the later phases of the process the revolution will occur earlier. In Germany, for instance, we now have a political crisis, whilst in India there is already a revolutionary situation. It is irrefutable, however, that if a revolutionary situation sets in in Germany to-morrow it will outstrip India in so far as the working class in Germany is far more mature and there is a tried Communist Party, whilst in India the Communist Party is only beginning to crystallise. Moreover, if to-morrow a revolutionary situation arose, for instance in Germany, it would probably out-

strip China, too, where the revolution is restricted to a part of the territory of the country only, in so far as attempts at intervention in Germany would have to contend against far greater difficulties than intervention in China.

In general it is extremely difficult to draw up the march-routes for the development of the revolutionary process on a world scale. Without, however, going into the question of which of the determining countries will arrive at the revolutionary object first, we must state that arrival at this object *during the course of the present-day world economic crisis* will depend most of all upon the subjective factor, upon whether the Communist Party of the given country keeps up with the rapidly developing events. *The question of tempo is now the chief question.*

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE WORLD ECONOMIC CRISIS INTO A CRISIS OF INDIVIDUAL SYSTEMS AND OF THE ENTIRE SYSTEM OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS.

For this question also Lenin gave us the methodological line. As is known, in his article "On the slogan of the United States of Europe," written in 1915, "Lenin put forward his well-known thesis :

"Unequal economic and political development is an indispensable law of capitalism. It follows that the victory of Socialism is at the beginning possible in a few capitalist countries, even in one, taken separately. The victorious proletariat of that country, having expropriated the capitalists and organised Socialist production at home, would rise against the rest of the capitalist world, attracting the oppressed classes of other countries, raising amongst them revolts, etc. (Lenin "Works," Vol. XVIII., p. 272.)

Taking this as his stand, Lenin considered that Russia had to begin the revolution in so far as she represented the weakest link in the world capitalist system. But if, in 1915, Lenin took into consideration the perspective for the victory of the *revolution* at first in one or in a few countries, this by no means implies that in his opinion there was a *revolutionary situation* at that time only in one or a few countries. Nay, on the contrary, in that same year, in 1915, Lenin wrote, in his article "The Collapse of the Second International" :

"It assumed (the Basle Manifesto in 1912.—A.M.) a revolutionary situation, which it briefly described as 'an economic and political crisis.' Has such a situation materialised? Undoubtedly so . . . there is a political crisis at hand—none of the governments is sure of the near future, none is secure against the danger of financial collapse, loss of territory, expulsion from its country . . .

All governments live on a volcano, all appeal of their own accord to the initiative and heroism of the masses. *The political regime of Europe has all been shaken.* (Italics mine.—A.M.) and probably nobody will deny that we have entered an era of the greatest political perturbations. *The political mainstays of Europe are shaking more and more,* etc. (Italics mine.—A.M.). (Lenin "Works," Vol. XVIII., p. 280.)

Thus, irrespective of the country or group of countries in which the revolution would commence, Lenin considered it possible in 1915 to speak of upheavals in the *political regime of the whole of Europe, of the tottering political foundations of the whole of Europe, of an all-European political crisis*, in so far as the whole of Europe was a scene of military actions. This permits us to bring up the question : Does not the present world economic crisis, which is of unprecedented historical acuteness, lead to a political crisis of all the systems, and even of the entire system, of international relations? Facts go to show that we can answer this question in the affirmative ; yes, it does lead, and has already partially resulted in this.

In the first place, we see the *beginning of a crisis in the Versailles system.* A whole series of facts points to this. The elections in Germany already showed the increased indignation of the majority of the German people against the Young Plan, which under the conditions of crisis and fall of prices has become the source of unbearable burdens for the oppressed classes. Then we see the beginning of a collapse in the Franco-German Steel Trust because Germany has been forced by the economic crisis to bring its iron and steel exports below the established quota, and because France, according to the constitution of the Steel Trust, has to reimburse Germany for this.

We see an intensification of the struggle against the Versailles system generally. We may mention the telegram sent by Hugenberg, demanding from Briand that he bring up the question of the freedom to arm. We may recall that the Geneva Conference resolved that, irrespective of the decisions of the conference pertaining to armaments, the paragraph of the Versailles Treaty on the one-sided disarmament of Germany is to remain in force, and that the extremely cautious organ of the German foreign office, "Deutsche Diplomatische Politische Korrespondenz" on this head openly protested against France. Finally, we have read the speeches made by Tardieu and Briand in

November against Germany. We may recall Tardieu's famous words :

"If the day does come when on the table of international conferences there is laid, with the slightest chance for success, a programme to review the treaties, a few months later a world war will break out . . ."

Again, the beginning of the crisis in the Versailles system is also expressed in a far more acute *intensification of Italo-French relations*. Just recall the extremely sharp speech made by Mussolini, directed against France, and the announcement that a French squadron would make a demonstrative voyage in the Adriatic Sea.

The beginning of the crisis in the Versailles system was also expressed in the *intensification of Germano-Polish relations*—the note of protest sent by Germany against the persecution of the German national minority in Upper Silesia during the forced elections to the Polish Sejm.

Finally, even France's attempts to set up a new "agrarian Entente" which is primarily a method of preparing intervention against the U.S.S.R., simultaneously pursue the object of strengthening the tottering Versailles system. Even the exceptional aggressiveness of French imperialism against the U.S.S.R. is to be explained by France's attempts to save and still more strengthen the predatory Versailles system by including in it, in the capacity of a new victim, this great country smashed and "freed" from the Bolsheviks.

The second system of international relations which is increasingly tottering under the influence of the world crisis is the *system of relations between England and her Dominions*. This found its expression in the complete fiasco of the British Empire Conference upon the close of which Thomas, Minister for Dominions, declared in the House of Commons that the demands presented at the Empire Conference by Bennett, Canadian Premier, and which were supported by the Prime Ministers of Australia, South Africa, and New Zealand, were nothing but "humbug." In reply to this there followed an official statement by Bennett in the press :

"If Canada's proposals are to be rejected with such contempt the Canadians can only note this and react to this rejection by using the other means at our disposal to further Canada's economic position in the world."

A transparent hint at an alliance with the United States.

The third system of international relations which is rapidly tottering under the influence of the world economic crisis is *the system of division*

of spheres of influence between Britain and the U.S.A. in the Latin American countries. The revolutionary coups occurring in all of these countries arise not only from the agrarian crisis and from the intensification of the contradictions between the peasant masses and their exploiters, connected with this, but arise likewise from the ever-increasing and extremely successful attempts made by the U.S.A. to effect a *new division of spheres of influence and semi-colonies*. The United States has already succeeded in helping to overthrow the old power in Argentine and Brazil, power which was a tool of Britain. The same perspective awaits Chile and Uruguay and other Latin American countries.

The fourth system of international relations which is rapidly tottering as the result of the world economic crisis is the *system of relations between the imperialists and the colonies and semi-colonies (China, India, Indo-China, and the Arab East, Egypt and Palestine)*. The revolutionary movements of varying degrees and acuteness in these colonies and semi-colonies have received a strong impetus, on the one hand, from the intensification of the agrarian crisis, and on the other hand, from the increased pressure of the imperialists (India, Egypt, Arabia) and from the intensified struggle between the imperialists, which in China finds its reflection in the completion of one round of wars between the generals and the new round being prepared for.

Finally, the world economic crisis is rapidly developing *into a crisis of relations between the entire capitalist world and the U.S.S.R., and greatly enhances the danger of intervention against the U.S.S.R.* This crisis is not a crisis of one of the systems of international relations, but is a crisis of the entire system of international relations, in so far as the contradictions between the capitalist world and the U.S.S.R. constitute the *chief and fundamental internal contradiction of the entire present-day epoch of the crisis of capitalism*.

It is quite clear that if the growth of the political crisis in the various countries is closely connected with and closely interested in any given system of international relations *closely affecting these countries* (for instance, the interaction between the crisis in Germany and the Versailles system) the growth of the political crisis *in all countries* is closely connected with

and closely interacts with the growth of the crisis in the relations between the capitalist countries and the U.S.S.R.: the intensification of the internal political crisis in the various capitalist countries impels them to institute intervention

against the U.S.S.R., and on the other hand, the drawing near of this intervention intensifies the internal crises, whilst the *intervention itself, when it does occur, will impart colossal scope to the revolutionary process throughout the world.*

INDIA IN 1930

BY M. ALI.

THE year 1930 in India was the period of a great rise of the national revolutionary movement. It was the year of Peshawar, Sholapur, Kishorigunj, Chittagong and other heroic battles fought by the Indian masses against the forces of robber imperialism. History will record how capitalist-imperialists in their insatiable greed for profit and plunder, massacred thousands of colonial slaves aroused to protest against the abject misery and degradation brought about by imperialist exploitation. It will record another important fact that in this period it was the "Socialists" of the Second International who, holding the reins of government in imperialist Britain, actually carried out this massacre. While MacDonald and Wedgwood Benn were butchering the Indian masses for their imperialist masters, Maxton and Brailsford, the left wing "Socialists", were applauding them.

ARMED INSURRECTION.

In the history of colonial revolutions, the year 1930 will constitute an important chapter in the struggle of the Indian masses against British imperialism. During this struggle, several theoretical questions relating to colonial revolutions were demonstrated in practice. It was shown first of all that even in the colonies where the people have been disarmed and prohibited to carry arms for centuries and are cowed down and demoralised by imperialist terror, armed insurrection is not only necessary, but entirely possible.

At least two large and important towns, Peshawar and Sholapur had to be evacuated by the British in the face of a mass attack of the Indian peoples who secured arms by overwhelming the police.

Sholapur is an important industrial town in the Bombay Province. Out of a population of

about 100,000, nearly 40,000 are workers employed in the cotton mills. At the beginning of May, a huge mass demonstration about 30,000 strong was held as in other towns, to protest against imperialist repression and the arrest of Gandhi. Police fired at the demonstration, killing 25 people and injuring 100. The crowd, including a great number of the workers who were all on strike, attacked the police, burst the police stations and other government buildings, seized arms and compelled the government authorities and armed forces to evacuate the city.

In Sholapur, the workers were the driving force of the revolutionary revolt. The movement went beyond the control of the treacherous national reformists under whose leadership the demonstration was held. According to the London "Times," the masses sought "to establish a regime of their own," and the "Daily Telegraph" actually called it a "sort of soviet." Detailed facts are not known. Anyhow, one thing is clear, that the Indian toiling masses can, in a revolutionary situation, take up arms with success and bravery in spite of all the teaching of non-violence, etc.

In Peshawar also, a mass demonstration was transformed into an armed fight. The situation was rendered more critical for the imperialists by a squadron of Indian troops not only refusing to shoot the people, but allowing themselves to be disarmed. Thus a rehearsal, on a small scale, of the real revolutionary drama which has to wipe away British imperialism from India for ever, was enacted, viz.: the mass armed insurrection and the going over of the Indian troops to the fighting masses. The town was evacuated by the armed forces of imperialism which re-occupied it ten days later.

The victory at Peshawar would have been impossible without the intensive struggle of the peas-

ant masses in the area around Peshawar. Pressed down by the heavy weight of land rents imposed by the imperialist feudal regime, enslaved by avaricious usurers, the peasants rose against imperialist authority. A partisan warfare was conducted by them. For them it is very easy to obtain arms from their kith and kin, the independent tribes living close by across the border. They were rapidly organised in the course of the struggle. The Red Shirts, originally an organisation of a few hundred persons, became 25,000 strong in the course of a few months. Then there were the trans-border tribes (Mohmands and Afridis) who, with their armed lashkars, threatened the British power. Hundreds of imperialist aeroplanes dropped thousands of tons of bombs on the villages, not only across the border, but within the frontier as well. The London "Times" proudly remarked that the average quantity of bombs dropped in a day on the frontier can be compared favourably with that thrown on the Western Front by the allied forces during the Great War.

Besides the armed struggle for power, Peshawar has laid down another issue as the order of the day, namely, revolutionary agitation among the Indian troops.

NATIONAL REFORMISM.

The events in Sholapur, Peshawar and other towns showed that the movement had grown beyond the limits fixed by the National Congress, the political organ of the Indian bourgeoisie. Gandhi, who was given dictatorial powers by the Congress in regard to the civil disobedience movement, had a definite programme aimed at promoting the interests of the Indian bourgeoisie. He wanted to make a show of fight with the British Government by means of which he could gain the support of the masses ready to fight against imperialism and put pressure on the British Government to come to favourable terms with the Indian bourgeoisie on such questions as tariffs, exchange, bankings, transport, and political concessions. His notorious eleven points, which need not be repeated here, show exactly his programme in regard to these issues. After the first violence which broke out in Calcutta, Karachi and Chittagong, Gandhi wrote :—

"At the very outset of the campaign I declared that there was every probability of some violence breaking out

on the part of the people. It seems now to have broken out and it hurts me because it hurts the cause I hold as dear as my life. . . I have therefore still every hope that at the end of the struggle it will be possible to say that even though regrettable acts of violence now and then broke out, it remained predominantly and overwhelmingly non-violent. *Not what happens in the cities, but what happens in the villages will this time decide the fate of India.*"

Besides his propaganda for non-violence which leads to crippling the resistance of the masses to imperialist terrorism, what he said about the villages is very important. Gandhi, as the representative of the Indian bourgeoisie, dreading revolution, understands the great importance of the peasantry in the Indian revolution. At the beginning of the present movement, the peasantry had not stirred on a great scale. The agrarian revolts of Kishorigunj, Burma and Berar were events of a later stage. Therefore Gandhi, with a sigh of relief, said "not what happens in the cities but what happens in the villages will this time decide the fate of India."

By saying that, he had another point in view. He seemed to believe that his salt campaign, and later on his campaign of non-payment of land revenue in Bardoli district, would be a sufficient dose to the Indian peasants to keep them away from the thought of an agrarian revolution.

Starting a movement of non-payment of land revenue in the Bardoli district is a pet scheme of Gandhi and his followers. He did the same thing in 1919-1921. Why? Bardoli has a predominating population of kulaks who lease land from the Government. Through constant agitation Gandhi's influence there is strong. It is easy, therefore, for Gandhi to make these kulaks refuse to pay land revenue taxes which, as in other parts of India, are very heavy. The advantage is that they will not go beyond the limits imposed by Gandhi. Such a movement serves to put pressure on the Government without leading to an agrarian revolutionary movement. That is why the Gandhites, closely allied with landlordism and usurers' capital, try their best not to allow the movement of non-payment of rents in districts where landlordism prevails, or even in those places where the poor peasants dominate. In Bengal, Behar, and the United Provinces for instance, the Congress did not sanction anything beyond the non-payment of *chaukidari* (police) taxes. And when, in spite of their efforts to check the

agrarian movement, the Kishorigunj revolt took place, the national bourgeoisie appealed to the imperialists to suppress it without mercy.

Gandhism is the national reformism of the Indian bourgeoisie. It represents and safeguards the interests of the Indian capitalists and landlords. Standing between the masses and the revolution it tries to extend its influence among the masses by such slogans as national independence, united national front, removal of poverty and misery of the people, etc. It does so in order to strike a favourable bargain with British imperialism. In a revolutionary situation Gandhism frightens imperialism with the "horrors of revolution," and appeals for co-operation. Thus, for instance, said the "Hindustan Times," an organ of the Congress :

"Let England understand that if Mahatma Gandhi's movement fails, the situation in India would change for the worse as far as the British are concerned and even the present ray of hope of an honourable settlement would vanish into the darkness of a chaotic future.

"What has happened at Chittagong and what occurred at Karachi and Calcutta are indications of the coming whirlwind if British statesmen fail to be impressed by the sincerity of the Satyagraha movement. Let British statesmen co-operate with the Mahatma in avoiding that whirlwind, or else India will become not only another Ireland, but probably, what is worse, another Russia."

It is clear from this quotation for what Gandhism stands, viz., for preventing revolution, for betrayal of the masses and for compromise with imperialism. The Indian bourgeoisie have taken the lessons of the Russian and Chinese revolutions to heart. Hence their warning to British imperialism, hence their attempts to disorganise the revolutionary revolt of the Indian workers and peasants.

The Indian capitalists love Gandhi as their own man. Of the several mass meetings organised by Indian capitalists in support of Gandhi, one was held in Bombay just after his arrest. The meeting protested against the arrest and demanded that the British Government come to terms with Gandhi as "the only man who represents the whole of India." The resolution passed by the meeting further said :

(By the arrest of Gandhi). "The Government have not only effectually destroyed the country's strongest guarantee for non-violent political agitation, but have also most effectively removed the one supreme check in the tendencies towards revolution which have already begun to be alarmingly noticeable in the country."

Gandhi not only attempts to save the Indian capitalists from revolution, but helps them in improving the conditions of the native textile

industry by leading a campaign of boycott of foreign cloth, demanding tariffs for the Indian industry and a favourable exchange rate of the rupee, etc. Boycott of foreign cloth is still the chief plank of the Congress programme. Congress volunteers are stationed to picket the shops dealing in foreign cloth. These pickets come into collision with the police as the British capitalists do not want to tolerate further blows to their already declining trade in India. Thus, Indian jails are filling with Congressmen who show themselves martyrs to the cause of Indian national freedom.

In consequence of the tremendous growth of the working-class movement during 1928-29, the Indian proletariat has travelled a long way on its road of development as an independent political force, as the prospective leader of all the anti-imperialist forces in the country. The Indian bourgeoisie were determined to fight with this new political force on the issue of hegemony in the national revolutionary movement. Therefore, they fought against the revolutionary vanguard of the Bombay proletariat, the Girni Kamgar Union. During the general strike of the Bombay workers in 1929, the National Congress made a united front with the imperialists and social reformists to break the strike and to smash the Girni Kamgar Union. Although the strike ended in defeat they could not break the union.

Later on, in 1930, when the full force of the economic crisis was felt in India and in virtue of the fact that 60-70,000 workers were thrown on the streets as unemployed in Bombay, the Congress bourgeoisie made another effort to disorganise and disrupt the Girni Kamgar Union. This time circumstances were favourable for them. The failure of the general strike had weakened the union. Unemployment had thrown many of its active members out of action. Imperialist repression had taken away its best leaders. Gandhi had launched his salt crusade and was making a show of a national revolutionary fight against imperialism, which had attracted the masses to the movement in which Gandhi and company held the hegemony. Instead of attacking the Red Flag Union as a whole, the Gandhists began to attack the Communist leadership with a view to isolating it from the rank and file. They organised a "labour week" in Bombay during which they

organised numerous meetings of workers, calling upon them to join the Congress in its alleged fight for national freedom. They spoke of the coming swaraj in which there would be no unemployment and no hunger as now. They condemned the Communist leaders as traitors to the cause of national freedom, as disrupters of the united national front, etc. They took the workers in lorries around the town and gave them good lunches.

By these tactics they succeeded in splitting the Girni Kamgar Union into two parts, one of which went over to them.

In its struggle for hegemony, the Indian bourgeoisie very profitably utilises the services of its pseudo-left-wing led by Jawaharlal Nehru, Bose, and others. These Gandhists appear among the workers, peasants and the revolutionary sections of the city petty bourgeoisie with their cleverly arranged masks of Socialism, revolutionary nationalism, etc. Jawaharlal, the "Socialist" (not hiding his hatred of Communists for their "evil deeds" in the Chinese revolution), would put forward a programme of qualified abolition of landlordism, abolition of peasant debts by partial compensation and improvement of the conditions of the working-class. Bose would even go so far as to agree to a plan of a national general strike "in order to frustrate the manoeuvres of the nationalist bourgeoisie to betray the cause of Indian independence by striking a bargain with British imperialism." (From the resolution adopted by the Executive Council of the All-India Trade Union Congress at Calcutta on November 18th, 1930).

A similar attempt may be recorded recently in the organisation of a "Punjab Socialist Party" by the national reformists under the auspices of the British Independent Labour Party. The "Socialist" Party was organised at the end of November, 1930, in Lahore, under the patronage of Brailsford. It has put forward the slogan of "Nationalisation of land" for which Brailsford was careful to point out the Party "would have to carry the fight to the councils and Legislative Assembly." Thus, "Socialism" and "nationalisation of land" are to be ushered in in India by the order of Lord Irwin or one of his successors and at the demand of the Indian bourgeois-landlords who dominate the councils and assemblies!

National reformism does its best to disorganise the revolutionary struggle of the workers and peasants and the city petty bourgeoisie with a view to put off the evil day (for it) of Indian revolution. But the revolution develops on the basis of the acute economic crisis. Gandhism is exposing itself and the treacherous masks of Nehru and Bose are being torn off in Kishorigunj and during other revolutionary campaigns of the workers and peasants.

THE ECONOMIC CRISIS.

The economic starvation of the colonies is not a new thing. It is more or less a constant phenomenon (with certain exceptional periods) brought about by the contradictions between growing productive forces and imperialist policy of obstructing them. Whatever industry exists in the colonies (mostly textile) has to struggle against the tariff, exchange, banking and transport policy of imperialism which holds all the key positions in regard to these. Thus, we had an economic crisis in India long before the world economic crisis set in. It was on the basis of this crisis that the great working-class movement of 1928-29 developed.

The economic crisis in the capitalist countries gave an additional heavy blow to Indian economy. The colonies are linked up economically with capitalist imperialist countries as suppliers of raw material and as markets for manufactured goods. As a result of the crisis, prices of the primary raw products in the colonies fall, the purchasing capacity of the masses further decreases. An agrarian crisis sets in. The native industry suffers as in capitalist countries. The whole crisis is intensified and made more complicated by the imperialist policy of checking the growth of the productive forces.

Already in 1929, prices of the chief Indian products (jute, cotton, wheat and rice, etc.) had fallen on an average from 20% to 30%. The price of silver had also declined by 20% to 30%. Thus the peasantry was hit hard. But during 1930 the crisis went still deeper. Comparison of the figures for November, 1929, and July, 1930, shows that jute prices had fallen during this time (eight months) by 30%, wheat by 38%, cotton by 40% and rice and ground nuts by 14% and 20% respectively.

Jute, cotton, rice and wheat fell below the cost of production. To make matters worse, there have been abundant crops of these products this year. The price of jute, for instance, which plays a great role in Indian economy (the jute industry is the largest industry employing 360,000 workers) has declined to two-and-a-half to three-and-a-half rupees a maund (about 40 kilos), the cost price being six rupees per maund (that is about half as much as the cost price).

"Only about one-fourth of this year's production has been marketed so far at the price mentioned, and even if the ryot is fortunate enough to sell the whole of his crops at this price, the total loss to the jute cultivators will be about two hundred million rupees, which means the worst possible calamity to the peasant." (Bengali, 18/9/30.)

A severe fall has also occurred in the prices of manufactured jute goods. Bengal, which has the monopoly of jute production in India, exports annually about nine hundred million rupees' worth of jute and jute manufactures, "and if the same quantity is exported this year—a big assumption when there is a general trade depression throughout the world—Bengal stands to lose to the extent of about four hundred million rupees." (Bengali, 18/9/30.)

India produced in 1930 a bumper crop of wheat amounting to about ten-and-a-half million tons. The pre-war average was 9.58 million tons. During the four years, 1925-1929, India produced on an average only 8.72 million tons and was obliged to import wheat from outside as production was not sufficient for internal consumption. But the irony of the situation is that India imported wheat even in 1930 to the extent of about 100,000 tons, mostly from Australia, although she was at a loss to find a market for her own surplus wheat. Thanks to the imperialist tariff policy, Australian wheat sells cheaper in Calcutta than wheat from the Punjab. This is explained by the simple fact that freight rates from Punjab to Calcutta for a maund of wheat (19 annas) are much higher than freight rates for a corresponding weight of wheat from Australia to Calcutta (only 6 annas).

The crisis has also hit Indian industry badly. In Bombay, 60,000 to 70,000 workers are unemployed on account of many cotton mills having ceased to work. Some cotton and woollen mills in the North have also stopped

working, throwing several thousand workers on the streets. The jute mills work for three weeks in a month and five days in a week. Unemployment in the industry is growing. The tin-plate workshop in Golmuri (near the Tata Iron Works) has been closed down.

Trade has considerably declined. The returns of Indian sea-borne trade for the first six months of the year 1930-31 show a fall of 28% in the value of imports and 21% in exports compared with the corresponding period of the previous year. The share of Great Britain in the import trade fell during three months, April-June, 1930, to 41.6% from 44% in the same period the previous year.

The gross revenue receipts of the Indian railways fell from 1,046 million rupees in 1929 to 1,024 millions in 1930, and net revenue receipts fell from 375.1 million rupees in 1929 to 335.2 million rupees in 1930. A deficit of seventy million rupees is expected in the railway budget in the present year.

THE PEASANT MOVEMENT.

The peasants, already ground down in poverty by high rents and heavy indebtedness, have been reduced to utter misery on account of the catastrophic fall of prices of their products. They are unable to pay rents to the moneylenders. They starve. Hence the agrarian revolts developing all over the country.

In the middle of July, 1930, a widespread agrarian revolt occurred in Bengal, which was mainly directed against the moneylenders. (The total indebtedness of the cultivators in Bengal amounts to 1,000 million rupees. The official Bengal Provincial Banking Enquiry Committee gave some examples in their report of exorbitant rates of interest. For instance, for a loan of 1,000 rupees, a decree of 18,000 was issued. Interest on a loan of fifteen rupees made in 1923 came to 9,450 rupees in 1929.)

The revolt extended over an area of 200 to 500 square miles covering Kishorigunj and some other districts. The peasants attacked the moneylenders (who in some cases are also landlords), burnt their houses, destroyed the debt bonds and in case of resistance killed the moneylenders and their relatives. Police and military forces were sent, who fired at the peasants on several occasions. In some cases the police were obliged to retreat before the peasants.

Some of the government offices in the districts were looted by the peasants. The Indian bourgeoisie of the Congress demanded that the Governor of Bengal crush the revolt, and even criticised the Government for not taking sufficiently severe measures.

According to the latest news, the movement there has not stopped, but has been going on ever since. The "Bengali" (17/12/30) announces that though more than 6,000 peasants have been sent to prison, "in connection with the last disturbance, further molestation of the Hindus (landlords and moneylenders), up to murder and grievous assaults, are still going on. The Mahommedan tenants of their locality refused in a body to pay any rent to the Hindus (landlords). When this state of affairs was brought to the notice of the district magistrate, he at once started with the special police for the affected area and visited almost all the villages. Everywhere he assured the Hindus that they need not apprehend any further molestations and any such occurrence would be dealt with very strongly and warned the Mahommedan leaders of the consequences of not paying rent due to the Hindus."

Not only this particular paper, but all the Nationalist Press of the Congress describes the conflict as between Hindus and Mussalmans and not between landlords and moneylenders and the peasants. The fact is that in Bengal nearly all the landlords and moneylenders are Hindus and the peasants Muslims. In July even some of the Muslim landlords were killed and their property looted. But still the national reformists, dreading an agrarian revolution, preferred to call it a Hindu-Muslim conflict. They invite imperialism to come to their aid and save them from the agrarian revolution. The prospects are gloomy for them, as can be seen from the following quotation from "Liberty," the Congress organ of Calcutta :

"The price of jute will go on falling, the commodity will soon be had free for its removal. The ruin of the ryot will be complete . . . The tragedy of Kishorigunj will be enacted in every district of Bengal and neither Lord Irwin nor Gandhi will be able to prevent the wholesale non-payment of taxes and revenues brought about by sheer want, starvation and sickness."

"Ah ! If only Gandhi would save us for ever from the agrarian revolution ! But he cannot. Not only he, but the great Viceroy of mighty Great Britain cannot do that. How dreadful,

how wicked ! Soviet agents have brought Bolshevism to India." Thus cry the Indian bourgeoisie. Even Gandhi cannot deceive the masses forever.

The agrarian riots in Bengal are the results of the fall in jute prices. Similar riots are taking place in Burma on account of the decline in rice prices, in Berar on account of the fall of cotton prices.

In Burma a fierce armed struggle is going on between the peasants and the armed forces of imperialism. "The peasants are conducting a partisan guerilla warfare, and take refuge in the thick forests. Since the movement started about ten days ago, three hundred peasants have been killed, two hundred wounded and three hundred taken prisoners." (London "Times," 5/1/31.)

In Berar and Sind moneylenders were attacked and killed as in Kishorigunj. In the United Provinces, the Punjab and Behar, the agrarian movement is spreading. Peasants refuse to pay rents to landlords and the Government. Clashes between armed police and peasants are frequent. The Government is distributing leaflets among the peasants explaining that it was no fault of theirs that prices had fallen, it was the world crisis and the Congressmen who were to be blamed for this state of things.

Besides these agrarian riots which began recently and are developing more and more, there had been riots in the early part of the year in connection with the movement of "Forest Satyagraha" (so-called by the Congress). The peasants in tens of thousands went into the forests, let their cattle graze there, and cut down timber. The forests are Government monopoly and people are not allowed to graze cattle or cut wood without paying for it. The Congress inaugurated this movement of breaking forest laws in their own manner, that is, by non-violent means, but many conflicts, in some cases even armed clashes, took place between the police and the peasants.

At the beginning of the Gandhi movement, the Secretary of State for India declared to the satisfaction of the House of Commons, that "rural India was quiet." Even imperialism understands that Indian revolution will not come unless the peasant masses revolt. To-day they are revolting and as neither imperialism nor

national reformism can solve the agrarian crisis the revolt will go on spreading and developing. To quote again from "Liberty" of Calcutta (5/12/30) :

"Hunger, the creator of revolutions, is abroad and stalking over the land with gigantic strides . . . In Bengal the peasantry and the labourers are on the verge of starvation. The same story of distress comes from the Punjab and the United Provinces. Bombay is on the crater of a volcano and look where we will, the same sinister signs of the coming storm stare us in the face."

Let the imperialists and bourgeois-landlords tremble before the coming revolution.

THE WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT.

By their heroic struggles fought in 1928-29 extending to the first part of 1930, the Indian workers gave a new orientation to the national revolutionary movement in general. It put an anti-imperialist stamp on the movement. The slogans "Down with Imperialism," "Long live revolution," etc., not only became common in the city, but penetrated to the villages as well. The peasants in many parts of the country also became acquainted with the working-class slogans "Long live Soviet India" and "Land to the peasants." This was clearly seen in the big peasant conferences held in the Punjab, the United Provinces and elsewhere. It was under the influence of the working-class revolutionary movement that the Red Shirts organisation with its slogans "Workers and Peasants of the World, Unite," and its symbol of the hammer and sickle was formed. It was the same influence which helped to crystallise the revolutionary wave of the petty bourgeois youth movement. Certain organisations such as Naujawan Bharat Sabha in the Punjab and the Nagpur Youth League, stood very close to the revolutionary proletariat.

The Congress national reformists observed the change. They were feeling it in the shape of merciless criticism directed against them by the Youth Leagues, peasants' conferences, etc.. After the Delhi manifesto, they were condemned as agents of imperialism, traitors and so on. They had, therefore, to change their tactics. First of all, they passed the resolution of complete independence at Lahore and then the Gandhi crusade began.

The anti-imperialist movement of the masses spread very rapidly. It went beyond the control of the Gandhists, but they were clever

enough to stick on to it and not relinquish their hold. Gandhi said after Chittagong and Calcutta that "there was no going back this time." By their cleverness, combined with the strength of their organisation and the weakness of the political organisation of the working-class, they maintained their hegemony in the movement.

The working-class organisations were weak. The revolutionary trade unions were much reduced in strength. The Communist Party was still in the process of creation. The working-class set the ball (of the anti-imperialist movement) rolling, but it travelled at such a fast speed that they could not keep pace with it, and Gandhi was able to play with it.

The working-class did take active part in the movement, but under the hegemony of the Gandhists. They swelled Gandhi's demonstrations in Bombay, Karachi, Calcutta and other towns. They fought bravely with arms in their hands as in Sholapur, but still not as an independent political force. No doubt there were independent demonstrations led by Communists on Lenin Day, May Day, the Unemployed Day, Independence Day, etc., but these demonstrations did not play the leading role, they were eclipsed by the huge demonstrations organised by the National Congress.

The strength of the trade unions as a whole fell heavily during 1930. The figures for the total membership of the trade unions in the Bombay Presidency in March, 1930, were 144,409 as compared with 196,748 in December, 1929, and 200,325 in March, 1929. In March, 1930, the Girni Kamgar Union had only 800 paying members, while in 1929 its strength had risen to 80,000. We have already seen how the Gandhists attacked the union and disrupted it.

The strike figures show the same picture. In 1928, 506,851 workers were on strike, in 1929 531,059, and in 1930 there will be not more than 150,000.

We are, however, on the eve of a new general upheaval of the working-class of India. This time the growth of the proletarian movement promises to be on a higher level organisationally and politically.

The Communist Party of India at least seems to have emerged into existence. The programme of action which it has issued is a document of the highest importance for the coming Indian revolution. The Communist Party is

making it known without any ambiguity to the toiling masses that the leader of revolution is already there to guide the further course of the Indian revolution without allowing it to be betrayed by the national reformists. The Party is showing the workers, peasants, city petty bourgeoisie and semi-proletariat the correct way to reach their goal of destroying the imperialist feudal regime.

The working-class is again gathering strength to renew its class war against imperialism and Indian capitalism. New strikes are taking place in Bombay, Ahmedabad and Calcutta. The Executive Committee of the All-Indian Trade Union Congress which met at Calcutta on November 17th to 18th, passed a resolution in favour of a general strike all over India. Concrete tasks have been fixed to be carried out in the way of preparing for the general strike. The revolution passed by the Executive Committee further demands "the establishment of a workers' and peasants' republic" "land for those who till it" and condemns the Indian bourgeoisie for their policy of compromise with imperialism. All these demands, in spite of the serious fault in the resolution of not attacking the landlords in connection with the demands of the peasants, must have been very unpalatable for S. Bose (the bourgeois Congress leader who is also the President of the All-India T.U.C.) and his reformist friends. The fact that they were obliged to swallow it shows that the militant spirit of the working-class is at work. The resolution of the general strike was moved by Comrade Deshpande, the leader of the Girni Kamgar Union.

With the rising of the new tide of the workers' movement, the Indian proletariat will conquer not only the influence lost to the national reformists, but, under the leadership of its Party, will win the hegemony of the national revolutionary movement as well.

THE TERRORISTS.

The programme published by the Communist Party of India will help it to draw also to its ranks and round its banner that revolutionary stratum of the city petty bourgeoisie, which, finding that Gandhism leads to nothing but treachery and compromise, are engaged in terrorist attempts. The terrorists activities of these revolutionary youths have increased very

much during the year. Several police officers have been killed and others attacked, even the Viceroy was attacked and the Governor of the Punjab wounded. Many "conspiracy cases" have been and are continually being heard all over India. Extreme penalties of death, transportation for life and long years of imprisonment have been inflicted on revolutionary terrorists. There is also a panic among the police and government officials.

Besides this, discontent in the Indian troops is increasing. Several British officers were killed recently.

The forces of revolution are thus ripening. Peasants, workers, revolutionary petty bourgeoisie are all fighting and their fight is developing more and more.

THE ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE.

Imperialism and its allies are not blind to this fact. British imperialists, Indian feudal princes, landlords, representatives of the Indian Liberal bourgeoisie, "responsive co-operators" (the Right wing Gandhists) have been deliberating in London, sitting at a Round Table. They have been conspiring against the Indian toiling masses, against the Indian revolution.

It has been decided in the first place to create a Federative States of India in which the Indian princes will have their due share while preserving autonomy in their internal affairs. It is proposed to have a "Federal Assembly" at Delhi and an "Upper House" as well, and the "princes and people" to sit together in these "Houses" to decide the fate of the Indian masses. So under MacDonald's presidency, British imperialism is organising in India a centralised imperialist feudal regime on a scale never thought of before.

The National Congress outwardly mocked at the Round Table Conference. The Gandhists want to show that they have nothing to do with this unholy conspiracy. But in fact their hearts were there. Their unofficial spokesmen, who continued negotiations between Gandhi and the British Government took an active part in the whole affair.

Gandhi and the Nehrus are clever. They are playing a double game, namely, of compromise with imperialism, through their friends and a show of fight to deceive the masses. The more the proceedings of the conference come to light,

the more it becomes clear that a compromise between MacDonald and Gandhi is being arrived at. A compromise between the Nehru Constitution and the Simon scheme is being worked out in London.

CONCLUSION.

The Indian bourgeoisie will compromise and

their real physiognomy will be exposed to the masses. The anti-imperialist struggle of the masses will be continued on a higher plane under the revolutionary leadership of the vanguard of the proletariat. All the conspiracies of imperialism and bourgeois-landlords will be smashed by the coming Indian revolution.

THE INTERNATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE REVOLUTION OF 1905

(On the 25th Anniversary of the Revolution of 1905)

PROUD of the favours of their bourgeois masters, the Social-Democratic "ideologists" regard it a sign of good taste contemptuously to ignore all things "Russian." They try to frighten the proletariat, now rising against capitalism, with the statement that the international Communist movement is following the example and orders of the "Russians."

Base and lying bourgeois-nationalist demagoguery!

The international proletarian revolution did indeed win its first, great, decisive victory in Russia. The experience of this victory, as well as of all the stages of the struggle which led to it, serves as a precedent for the world proletariat. But the proletariat of capitalist countries takes a lesson from the triumphant "Russian" revolution just because it is not *Russian* in a limited, narrow, nationalist sense, but is, in substance, *international*, a revolution which, though effected in one country, went beyond the peculiarities of this country.

The revolution of 1905, this outstanding step on the road to October, its "general rehearsal," is as international as is October itself.

Both basic forces which met in open struggle in 1905 were international: the "Russian" Tsarist autocracy and the "Russian" proletariat.

With the maturing of western-European capitalism and its transformation into a reactionary force, Russian Tsarism became the bulwark of the international bourgeoisie in its struggle against the growing workers' movement. The international feudal gendarme became the international bourgeois gendarme, combining both functions within Russia.

Tsarism was united to the bourgeois world by many financial and political threads (it would be

more correct to say—by steel cables). The international bourgeoisie utilised Tsarism for its own defence against the proletariat and, in its turn, helped Tsarism in its struggle against the Russian people's revolution. "Free," "republican" France particularly distinguished itself in this respect as a political ally of the monarchy of the knout, helping it to crush the revolution of 1905 with its loans of millions.

Therefore those blows which the Russian workers and peasants dealt the police State of the Romanoffs in 1905 were blows against the international reactionary bourgeoisie as well. The Russian proletariat come forward as an international force.

It is not accidental, therefore, that the revolution of 1905 was immediately reflected widely in the surrounding world. It was a stimulating, quickening force to the bourgeois revolution in Turkey, Persia, and China. It helped the Austrian proletariat to win universal suffrage. It was a menace and warning to the international bourgeoisie and forced it to become slightly more conciliatory in its attitude to the proletariat. This is shown particularly clearly by the series of "reforms" undertaken in England by the Liberal Government, in which Lloyd George was the chief figure.

It is necessary to remind Social-Democrats and all other hypocrites of this.

Lenin called the revolution of 1905 the "*prologue to the coming European revolution*," and this is very true. *The revolution of 1905 was the first revolution to break up the epoch of the stabilisation of capitalism, established after the defeat of the Paris Commune.* In substance it was the first open struggle in the twentieth century between the world proletariat and the

world bourgeoisie, the first struggle which augured the speedy approach of the "epoch of war and revolution." The Russian workers and peasants in 1905 did work of great international significance.

The international character of the revolution of 1905 does not, certainly, exclude specific, local, "Russian" peculiarities. Every large, general phenomenon assumes individual concrete forms. The first struggle of the world proletariat against the world imperialist bourgeoisie, took the form of an agrarian-peasant, bourgeois-democratic revolution led by the proletariat, and directed against a feudal-landlord, Tsarist autocracy evolving towards capitalism.

The revolution of 1905 was an agrarian-peasant revolution, because for the Russia of that period the most significant and most mature class antagonism was that between the peasants and the landlords. Thirty thousand landlords owned as much land (70 million acres) as ten million peasant households. The holding of one peasant family averaged seven acres, while that of a land magnate—2,333 acres (that is 333 times larger). The struggle for the land was the chief motive force which drove the mass of the Russian population, the peasantry, toward revolution.

The revolution of 1905 was a bourgeois-democratic revolution because the struggle of peasants against landlords for land assumed and generally assumes just such a character. It does not threaten capitalism but clears the way for it. The class relations of Russia of that day were such that they did not permit the placing of the question of a Socialist revolution on the order of the day prior to the overthrow of absolutism. The proletariat itself was not yet ready for it. They could not set down the establishment of a Socialist dictatorship as an immediate task. That went into the perspective of struggles to come.

However, the Russian proletariat (and only the proletariat) could set (and did set) as the immediate task, the leadership of the peasantry, and, to some degree, that of the national bourgeois-democratic movement. The Russian bourgeoisie was very closely bound to the landlords and to Tsarism. It went no further than a timid, hypocritical and treacherous opposition. In the decisive and difficult moments of the

revolution it came out openly in defence of Tsarism. The proletariat won from it the hegemony of the bourgeois-democratic revolution.

The revolution of 1905 thus goes down in history as a specific, contradictory, transitory phenomenon. Bourgeois-democratic social content and proletarian leadership and methods of struggle—such were the two sides of this contradiction. Lenin expressed it more briefly in the main Bolshevik slogan of that period—"the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry."

* * *

The very peculiarities of the revolution of 1905 have no less world significance than the break in capitalist stabilisation in the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries occasioned by it. The agrarian-peasant revolution turned out to be something not peculiar to Russia. Different types and forms of the agrarian-peasant revolution were and are on the order of the day in the historical development of large masses of humanity—China, India, Latin America, not to mention a large number of other smaller colonial and semi-colonial countries.

In these cases another important characteristic is added to the agrarian-peasant character of the revolution—a *national-liberating, anti-imperialistic struggle*. In the revolution of 1905 this feature took on a different and less developed form. Fifty-seven per cent. of the population of Tsarist Russia belonged to oppressed nationalities. Their struggle was at the same time both a struggle for bourgeois democracy and for national liberation. But it is clear that this struggle differed in its form from present-day anti-imperialistic struggles of colonial nations.

To this it is necessary to add that the agrarian-peasant side of the revolution of 1905 also differed basically from contemporary agrarian peasant revolutions. The agrarian relations of old Russia, China, India, Latin America—is far from being one and the same, and the historical setting of the struggle in Russia in 1905 was not the same as that in present-day China and India, where the revolution opens up prospects of a non-capitalist development.

But one very basic feature remains in common—the *task of the proletarian leadership of the wide*

mass peasant movement, essentially of a bourgeois-democratic character, aiming at turning a bourgeois revolution into a Socialist one. The slogan "the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry" preserves its political reality for a large number of countries to this very day. The revolution of 1905 and the Bolshevik tactics in this revolution are a model which Communist Parties of the above-mentioned countries must follow, certainly not blindly or mechanically, but with due consideration for the peculiarities of the epoch and the different local settings.

Unfortunately, the experience of the proletarian leadership of the bourgeois-democratic revolution gained by the Bolsheviks in 1905 has neither been studied nor mastered sufficiently. The Chinese Communist Party, which won a number of important victories which are of colossal value to the world proletariat, also made a number of mistakes because it did not understand clearly how the proletarian leadership of an agrarian-peasant, anti-imperialist revolution must carry out its tasks.

In 1927 these mistakes were clearly of a "right" opportunist character. Fighting together with what were at that moment revolutionary elements of the national bourgeoisie against the agents of imperialism, the opportunist leadership of the Chinese Communist Party did very little to tear the leadership of the movement out of the hands of the national bourgeoisie. On the contrary, it left all the initiative in the hands of a class enemy, thus depriving the proletariat of the possibility of resisting the counter-revolutionary volte face of the national bourgeoisie which was effected that year.

In 1930 the mistakes of the Li Li-Shan leadership were a combination of "right" and "left". Li Li-Shan ignored the task of a close bond between the proletarian vanguard and the peasant masses, and of the strengthening of the Soviet districts. Externally this was a "left" setting. But as in all such similar cases, it appears to be "right" as well, since the demands of the peasants for land would have been unsatisfied and the poor peasant given over into the hands of the kulak had this line been put into practice. Fortunately, the workers themselves, on the spot made substantial corrections of this policy. A resolute condemnation of Li Li-Shan's mistakes and their immediate decisive correction are essential at present.

The great Chinese revolution will be victorious only if it can carry out correctly Lenin's slogan of the "democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry," the slogan of the revolution of 1905. One must always remember that this slogan, expressing the contradictions, the transient character of the bourgeois-democratic revolution led by the proletariat and having a tendency to grow into a Socialist revolution has two mutually related and equally important sides. First—the *proletarian leadership* which must be upheld with all its strength and without which the movement loses its revolutionary meaning and significance. Neglect of this brings about "right" mistakes. And secondly, the union of *proletarian leadership with mass peasant struggle* without which the movement degenerates into sectarianism, into "putschism," and is doomed to vegetate impotently. Neglect of this lends to "left" mistakes.

One must suppose that its own rich experience, added to the experience of 1905, will keep the Chinese Communist Party from repeating in the future either right or "left" mistakes, particularly since the Comintern systematically struggled and struggles to set the Chinese Communist Party on a correct line.

* * *

The experience of the revolution of 1905 is of significance not only for backward countries which have not had, or completed their bourgeois-democratic revolution. To the extent that the basic, moving and leading force of the revolution of 1905 was the proletariat, and the basic, decisive methods of struggle were proletarian, the struggle of the proletariat in the most highly developed capitalist countries has much to learn from the experience of 1905.

One of the more important phases is the experience of mass political strikes.

"The Russian revolution is the *first* one in the history of the world, but it will undoubtedly not be the last great revolution, in which mass political strikes will play an unusually important role"—said Lenin.

It is known that on the eve of 1905 large masses of the working-class still did not possess any revolutionary consciousness. They awoke to this consciousness only in the very process of the revolution. And the thing which played the most important part in this awakening of a revolutionary consciousness, in effecting the

transition from a "dozing Russia" to a fighting Russia—was the mass strike. Speaking in Lenin's words, the mass strike "represented the most important means for stirring up the masses and the characteristic feature in the wave-like growth of decisive events."

A few figures to illustrate this situation: The total number of workers participating in strikes in the course of 1905 was 2,863,000, amounting to 163% of the industrial workers of Russia. This means that many strikers struck several times in the course of one year.

For the decade 1895-1904 the average annual figure for strikes in the United States was 660,000, in Germany 527,000, in France 438,000. This means that in the number of strikers, the "backward" Russian proletariat in its revolutionary sweep, exceeded the U.S.A. by 4.3 times and France by 6.5 times. If one is to take into account that the numerical strength of the Russian proletariat was much smaller than that of the proletariat in America and France, the difference becomes even more amazing.

Lenin attached very great significance to analysis of the strike movement. He saw in the comparative figures cited above very conclusive proof of the fact that the energy of the revolutionary proletariat is inexhaustible.

"Humanity up to 1905 had not known," said Lenin, "how great, how grandiose can be and will be the exertion of the forces of the proletariat once the issue is a struggle for some really great, really revolutionary, aim."

Lenin especially emphasises that the swing to revolution, to a stormy manifestation of energy on the part of the proletariat, proceeds in unexpected and sharp moves. "In January, 1905, in the first month of the revolution, the number of strikers was 440,000. That means that for one month there were more strikers than in the whole previous decade."

All this is full of great significance for the contemporary revolutionary struggles of the world proletariat. The basic laws of historical development do not change. Sharp movements, revolutionary jumps, unusually quick development of the movement will take place wherever national, political crisis approaches.

The Communist Parties must be ready for these sudden changes and prepare for them by daily, practical work.

Such preliminary preparatory work is particularly important for those Communist

Parties which have not yet turned into a real mass power. They must keep in mind that, in the words of Lenin, "the proletariat can develop the energy of struggle a hundred times greater in times of revolution than in ordinary, peaceful times." The Bolsheviks were not yet a particularly strong party numerically on the eve of the revolution of 1905. But in the process of the first months of the revolution, the "hundreds of revolutionary Social-Democrats 'suddenly' grew into thousands, and the thousands became the leaders of from two to three million proletarians." A similar transformation will be experienced by many sections of the Communist International, and mass political strikes will play a decisive role in this change.

The role which the mass political strike played in 1905 already at that time turned the attention of the proletariat of the whole world upon it. A lively discussion of this question arose in German Social-Democratic circles. The revolutionary wing of German Social-Democracy already showed then that the strike experience of 1905 was of great international significance.

The experience of the revolution of 1905 shows more than the mere general fact of the outstanding significance of mass strikes. It also shows the significance of the bond between economic strikes and political strikes and between strikes and a revolution.

"Only the closest bond between these two forms of strikes (economic and political) guaranteed great power to the movement," says Lenin.

It is necessary to be guided even now by this direction. An economic strike, that is, a movement with immediate, concrete, economic demands of the working masses, gives the struggle particular stability, guarantees a solid, mass base. But only a political strike signifies the transition of the movement to a higher plane, the beginning of the struggle for the demands of the proletariat as a class, in direct opposition to the bourgeoisie as a class.

However, the mass political strike is not the last stage in the class struggle. The experience of 1905 is particularly valuable just because it clearly showed how unavoidable and necessary for the development of the revolution is the transition from political strikes to an armed uprising. No matter to what extent the political

strike may go, by itself it means only "pressure" on the bourgeois government. No matter how great a victory is won through the help of such strikes it leads only to limited concessions from the bourgeois government remaining in power. Such a victory can only be a partial one. It gives the Government a "respite" and thus the future means to throw the proletariat back from the positions won.

Only an armed rebellion, following mass political strikes and preparations for it, can shake off the bourgeois government and give the proletariat a completely "stable" victory. Lenin called the December uprising in Moscow the "summit" of the revolution, its decisive moment.

The Bolsheviks proved, in the revolution of 1905, their ability to combine an economic strike with a political one, and to proceed from a political strike to an uprising. They showed their ability to work among the masses, not ignoring such organisations as there were, even, for example, the police organisation in Petersburg led by Father Gapon. By their tireless work among the masses and their capable handling of the situation, the Bolsheviks broke up the old, naive beliefs of the masses, to which end they were certainly helped by the objective course of events, and in particular by the shooting at the peaceful demonstration of January 22nd, in St. Petersburg. The Bolsheviks also showed their ability to work in the army. In 1905 the uprising against Tsarism was reflected in many military sections. The revolt on the armoured cruiser "Potemkin" is the clearest, best known example.

Finally, the Bolsheviks and only the Bolshevik understood the real significance of the Soviets, this powerful, mass proletarian organisation, springing up elementally in the process of the struggle. The Soviets originated, for the most part, as strike committees, and in the course of the struggle developed into organs of rebellion and embryonic organs of revolutionary power. *This* significance of the Soviets, as organs of the dictatorship of a revolutionary nation, was defended by the Bolsheviks against the Mensheviks with all their power.

All this has actual significance now. Work among the masses is the weakest, "narrowest" spot in many sections of the Comintern and in many local organisations. The necessity of

struggling for every rank and file worker no matter how foreign to us is the party he may belong to is far from being well understood. Neither is the combination of the struggle for practical demands with the struggle for general class interests of the proletariat always understood and carried out. The Bolshevik experience of 1905 can serve as a good guiding precedent in all these points.

We do not wish to say with this that the work of the Bolsheviks in 1905 had no weak points or defects. Undoubtedly there were shortcomings there and it is no less important and instructive to study them as it is to study the positive side. Work in the army was carried on but, for example, carried on to an insufficient degree, and not continuously. The transition from strikes to the uprising was effected, but the leadership of the uprising was neither united nor organised enough. All this is not to be surprised at. The Party was still very young and had insufficient forces. The Russian proletariat as a whole was not sufficiently mature. The peasant movement has not swung into proper stride as reflected in the position taken up by the army, which, recruited as it was from the sons of peasants, guaranteed despite its vacillation the victory of Tsarism at the decisive moment.

But in spite of it all, the revolutionary work carried on in 1905 has given us many excellent examples unexcelled even to this day.

What is particularly important is that the Bolsheviks put clearly before themselves the problem of the organisation of the revolution. There were many quarrels with the Mensheviks on this point. They said that the revolution can only be "unravelling," that is, that the revolution is an elemental process and that the task of the Party consists only of agitation and propaganda, in pushing the nation on to revolutionary action. Rosa Luxemburg shared this point of view at that time. Lenin and the Bolsheviks said that, on the contrary, it was impossible to depend on a single elemental process. The Bolsheviks held that the task of the Party consisted not only in calling upon the masses to action, but in organising these actions, in leading them, and in bringing about a victory.

It is difficult to express how great is the significance of this statement of the question for the present period. The task of organising the

revolution in the sense of controlling its elemental movement and guiding it further systematically from one stage to another is the basic task now before the Communist Parties of the capitalist countries.

* * *

It is thus clear that the international revolutionary "inheritance" left by 1905 is very great and very important.

But we have not yet come to the greatest and most important part of this inheritance. All the various things we spoke about: strikes, uprisings, soviets, all the various tasks which we touched upon: work among the masses, in the army, the organisation of the revolution—all this is united and merged, all this is closely connected with the main and fundamental point: *the revolutionary party of the proletariat*.

Of all that 1905 left to the world proletariat, the most valuable and significant is undoubtedly the *Bolshevik Party* itself and the theory of the Party worked out by it.

Russian Social-Democracy, as is known, was organised as a Party at its first congress in 1898. This was not its final organisation. It was yet necessary for the Iskra group to work a few years in order to form a really revolutionary and correctly organised Party. This was brought about in 1903 in conditions of a sharp struggle against opportunism. Bolshevism took form in 1903 at the Second Party Congress. Though not breaking formally with the Menshevik wing, it actually represented already an independent party. This is particularly clearly shown in the beginning of 1905 when the line separating Bolshevism and Menshevism in organisational questions grew into two opposing principal lines of action in the revolution.

The earlier separation of Bolshevism from opportunism and the decisive struggle against the latter which was extended through all later history was of colossal significance in the training and tempering of the Bolshevik Party. It prepared Bolshevism for the great historical tests of 1914 and 1917. It prepared Bolshevism for the role of vanguard and leader of the world proletarian revolution.

The Bolshevik Party was the only one which did not turn traitor or lose itself at the beginning of the world war. It was the first party which led and brought about the victory of the proletarian revolution. It leads a colossal country which is building Socialism in a new

way, unknown to previous history. The U.S.S.R. is the country of Bolshevism—is the fundamental base of the world proletarian revolution, and guarantees its final victory.

It is quite clear that it is the epoch of 1905, that is, the pre-revolutionary setting and the revolution itself which called the Bolsheviks into life.

The sharp, revolutionary situation, the pressure of the class struggle, the complexity of the maturing historical problems called into life an organised revolutionary force which set about solving those problems and which finally solved them.

Therefore, though the revolution of 1905 was defeated, it nevertheless, in its general historical aspect, is a victory and not a defeat. The creation of Bolshevism, its tempering, the building up of a theory of the Party and about the hegemony of the proletariat in a national revolution is a colossal, world-wide, historical achievement which laid the ground for the new, and still greater achievements of our epoch.

It is necessary to keep in mind here that Bolshevism and Bolshevik theory did not just grow up unexpectedly on the basis of Russian conditions alone. Lenin and the other Bolsheviks who, in 1905, and on the eve of 1905, created the Bolshevik Party, turned to the theory of Marx and Engels and to the rich revolutionary experience of the world proletariat. They carried over this experience and this theory to Russian soil, enriched it with their own experience and developed the theory further.

Bolshevism, the most valuable inheritance of 1905, is thus an international phenomenon. It developed originally on Russian soil because this soil was most ready in a Socialist sense. In the beginning of the twentieth century, the class struggle took on its sharpest form in Russia. Speaking in the words of Lenin, "only struggle educates the exploited class, only struggle opens up to it the measure of its capacities, widens its horizon, increases its ability, clarifies its mind, forges its will."

In vain are the servants of the bourgeoisie ironical about the "Russian" features of Bolshevism. The sharpness of the class struggle, its unusual pressure is now being felt by the whole world. This creates and strengthens the Bolsheviks—German, French, English, etc. They will show how the proletariat decides its matured, historical tasks.

LENIN WEEK means reading LENIN'S WORKS

of his collected works the following have been published :

VOLUME IV. THE "ISKRA" PERIOD.

8vo. In two volumes.

Part 1. 336 pages. Cloth. 10/6. \$3.00.

Part 2. 318 pages. Cloth. 10/6. \$3.00.

The writings included here deal with the informative period of the Bolshevik Party and the evolution of the policies and tactics which finally triumphed in the October, 1917 Revolution. The famous brochure "What is to be Done?" and an extended study of the agrarian question are included.

VOLUME XIII. MATERIALISM & EMPIRIO-CRITICISM.

8vo. 368 pages. Cloth. 10/6. \$3.00.

After the Revolution of 1905, a number of outstanding revolutionary figures exhibited friendly attitudes towards the empirio-critical and positivist schools of philosophy. In a brilliant polemic, Lenin proves their philosophy to be a fundamental revision of the philosophic foundations of Marxism and writes a defence of dialectical materialism as related to other philosophic systems.

VOLUME XVIII. THE IMPERIALIST WAR.

8vo. 496 pages. Cloth. 12/6. \$3.50.

Soon after the outbreak of the World War, Lenin made a brilliant analysis of its causes and its direction, launched an attack on the Socialist and Labour elements who were supporting it and the Governments which prosecuted it, and formulated a policy for turning this war between nations into a struggle between classes.

VOLUME XX. THE REVOLUTION OF 1917.

Part 1. 382 pages. Cloth. 10/6. \$3.00.

Part 2. 420 pages. Cloth. 10/6. \$3.00

In this volume are collected together all Lenin's writings and speeches covering the period from the overthrow of the Tsar in March to the first open conflict with the Provisional Government—The July Days.

JOHN W. WHEELER-BENNETT, in the JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, writes of the Lenin Series :

"In Volume IV. the 'Iskra Period,' appear the writings of Lenin in the 'Iskra,' the more militant organ of Marxism, and the 'Zarya,' a more theoretical journal. During these early years of the twentieth century, the Russian Revolutionary Party was standing at the cross-roads, hesitating as to which policy to pursue . . . The fact that the working-class of Russia accepted Lenin's policy was due in no small degree to the effect of these articles in 'Iskra.'"

"In the volume dealing with the War are included all Lenin's passionate denunciations of the Second International for their betrayal of the cause of Labour and their failure to carry out the Basle Manifesto. From

denunciation he turned to reorganisation, and his later writings in this period give the basis upon which was founded later the Third International. The last volume, 'The Revolution of 1917,' covering the period from Kerensky's Revolution in 1917 to the eve of the abortive Bolshevik *coup d'état* in July, is of absorbing interest. Lenin was at Zurich when the revolution broke out in Petrograd, and one is at once struck by the clear forcefulness with which even at a distance he saw immediately the weakness of the Kerensky régime and issued his instructions accordingly for its overthrow . . . Once arrived in Petrograd on April 16th, Lenin devoted himself to the reorganisation of the Bolshevik Party on fighting lines and the discrediting of Kerensky in the eyes of the workers. In both these objects he was remarkably successful, and the pamphlets, articles and speeches by which this success was achieved make extraordinarily interesting reading. . . . The general arrangement of the volumes is excellent. Footnotes are rare, but at the end of each book is a wealth of explanatory, biographical and bibliographical matter, together with a diary of the life of Lenin during the period covered by each volume. The documents appended to 'The Imperialist War and the Revolution of 1917' are of great historical interest."

MEMORIES OF LENIN. By N. Krupskaya. Vol. I. to 1907. Translated by E. Verney.

These reminiscences of Lenin by his wife and co-worker are of historical and personal interest. They show in a simple engrossing way the development of Lenin's leadership.

213 pages. Cloth. 5/- . \$1.50. Postage 6d.

Arnold Bennett writes of this book :—"I have just read a partial biography (of Lenin) which I like, Krupskaya's book is in its Russian way nearly as readable as Mrs. Hardy's 'Hardy' or Edgar Wallace's 'Edgar Wallace,' (both wonderful) . . . A portrait of a great and an honest man emerges. I read 'Memories of Lenin' with a certain gusto."

The Observer, 13th July, 1930 :—"This is a remarkable book. It is simple, conscientious, matter of fact and transparently sincere. In it, Lenin's widow uses her recollections of their life together as a thread on which to string her record of his methods of work and of the development of his thought. . . . The details of his life abroad make interesting reading : English readers will be specially attracted by the chapter on London, the more so because in it Mme. Krupskaya shows herself possessed of the sense of humour for which revolutionary enthusiasm usually leaves no place."

The Week-End Review :—" . . . It deepens our knowledge and understanding of the great resource and will of one of the really outstanding figures in history."

The Manchester Guardian :—"Of all that has so far been written about Lenin nothing is so revealing as this modest, simply written little book by his widow . . . No short review can do justice to this little book, which must become a principal authority for all future studies of Lenin. The translation has been respectfully and carefully done."

Postage extra.

MARTIN LAWRENCE, Ltd., 26 Bedford Row, LONDON, W.C.2
or INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS, INC., 381 4th Avenue, NEW YORK

THE WORKERS' COUNTER BARRAGE

Now, as the bourgeois attack on Russia reaches its spate of lies and intrigues
—now, spread the truth.

RUSSIAN WORKERS' FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM

In Soviet Russia. . Autumn, 1930	6d.
The Five Year Plan of the Soviet Union (³⁴⁰ pages, paper bound).	5/-
Five Year Plan and the Cultural Revolution	2d.
U.S.S.R. in Construction	2/6
New Phase in the Soviet Union	6d.
Modern Farming—Soviet Style	2d.

STALIN POCKET SERIES

Report to the Sixteenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party	2/6 & 1/6
Building Collective Farms	2/6 & 1/6
Life of Stalin	2/6 & 1/6

THE WRECKERS EXPOSED

W. M. HOLMES, special "Daily Worker" correspondent, describes the recent Moscow Trial. The significance of the trial interpreted for workers. The truth about proletarian justice. *Illustrated.* Twopence.

THE DEVELOPING CRISIS OF WORLD CAPITALISM :

The Tasks of the Communist International

V. M. MOLOTOV.

Sixpence.

WORKING WOMEN — WAR IS COMING

One Penny.

MODERN BOOKS LTD., 16 KING STREET, LONDON, W.C.2.
WORKERS' LIBRARY PUBLISHERS, 35 EAST 125th ST., NEW YORK.

PRINTED BY BLACKFRIARS PRESS LTD., SMITH-DORRIEN ROAD, LEICESTER, ENGLAND.